

LIGUORIAN

25¢ SEPTEMBER, 1958

WHAT IS THIS "NATURAL LAW?"

CHARITY BEGINS ABROAD

MUST WE AID FOREIGN NATIONS?

DON'T CARRY A GRUDGE!



THE Liguorian

Editor:

M. J. Huber, C.S.S.R.

Assistant Editor:

L. G. Miller, C.S.S.R.

Associate Editors:

F. J. Connell, C.S.S.R.,
S.T.D., LL.D.

D. F. Miller, C.S.S.R.
E. Miller, C.S.S.R.

T. E. Tobin, C.S.S.R.

J. Schaefer, C.S.S.R.

R. Miller, C.S.S.R.

D. Corrigan, C.S.S.R.

J. E. Doherty, C.S.S.R.
F. M. Lee, C.S.S.R.

Promotion:

H. Morin, C.S.S.R.

C. A. Bodden, C.S.S.R.
A. Slane, C.S.S.R.

Subscription Manager:

J. Elworthy, C.S.S.R.

•

Two Dollars per year
Canada & Foreign \$2.25

•

Devoted to the
Unchangeable Principles
of Truth, Justice,
Democracy and Religion,
and to All That
Brings Happiness to
Human Beings

•

Published Monthly by the Redemptorist Fathers and entered as second-class matter at the Post Office at Liguori, Mo., under the act of March 3, 1879. — Acceptance for mailing at special rates of postage provided for in section 1103, act of October 3, 1917. Authorized July 17, 1918. Published with ecclesiastical approval.

8

Contents for September, 1958

What Is This "Natural Law?"	1
Don't Carry a Grudge!	8
Charity Begins Abroad	10
Is Organic Transplantation Allowed?	14
A Housewife Looks at Marriage and the Priesthood	15
What Do You Believe?	19
Sanctifying Your Job	22
Objections to Christ	24
The Pope's Authority	30
Must We Aid Foreign Nations?	32
Readers Retort	37
Mistakes about Prayer	42
A Husband Who Refuses To Be a Husband	46
What Is the Meaning of "Separation of Church and State?"	48
Pointed Paragraphs	54
Liguoriania: The World Converted	58
Book Reviews	61
Lucid Intervals	64

VOLUME 46

NUMBER 9

THE LIGUORIAN IS INDEXED
IN THE CATHOLIC PERIODICAL INDEX

THE LIGUORIAN

LIGUORI, MO

WHAT

IS

THIS

Much of the moral teaching of the Catholic Church centers about what is called the natural law. Too few people have a clear idea of what this means. We hope this will help many to understand.

“NATURAL LAW?”

DONALD F. MILLER, C.SS.R.

HAVE you ever been perplexed, perhaps even frustrated, when, in answer to your question about the morality of a certain action, you were brushed off quickly with this reply: “Oh, that can never be lawful under any circumstances because it is contrary to the natural law?” Have you felt like saying, perhaps more loudly than necessary, “What is this natural law?” Or, “By what right do you close the door to all argument by that simple phrase, *the natural law*?”

If such questions have bothered you, or even if you have merely wondered about the subject-matter involved, this article is for you.

Few topics are of more importance, and few enter more often into discussions by priests and Catholic authorities on specific problems of

right and wrong. Consider a few examples:

1. Irreligious psychiatrists sometimes recommend to frustrated persons under their care that they relieve their tensions by indulging in certain forms of sex-conduct, outside of and contrary to the purposes of marriage. Informed Catholics always say that this is immoral advice, because all forms of impurity are contrary to the natural law.

2. Irreligious physicians sometimes recommend to a husband or wife that direct sterilization be submitted to as the only solution to acute problems they face in marriage. All Catholic authorities say that to act upon such advice would be a mortal sin because direct sterilization is contrary to the natural law.

3. Wives and husbands sometimes feel that they have a dozen argu-

ments for justifying the practice of contraception. Yet any priest whom they may ask about this will invariably answer that no argument justifies birth-prevention because it is contrary to the natural law.

4. Even so-called mercy-killing or euthanasia, that is, putting the old and incurably ill out of their misery by painless murder, has its advocates today. All Catholic authorities say that it is viciously immoral because it is contrary to the natural law.

Surely it is important that all Catholics, and all thinking people, be able to go a step farther and explain why the natural law is credited with making certain actions universally and unchangeably wrong. This explanation is intended to be a help toward that end. It will require a bit of concentration, but who has ever learned anything of value without mental labor pains? It will consider: I. Laws in general. II. The natural law in particular. III. Examples of the natural law. IV. The need of authority to guard the natural law.

I. LAWS IN GENERAL

ALAW in general, as it applies to human beings, is defined as a rule and measure of actions to be performed or to be omitted, made known in some way to the practical reason of man as related to his own good and the common good of all, by one who has authority over subjects and power to enforce the just laws he imposes. That is a long definition, but every element in it is important. Broken up into simple terms, the elements are these: A law

1) directs a person's actions toward

what is good for him and the community; 2) it has been made known to him in some way; 3) it comes from one who has care and authority over a community; 4) it can be enforced by the one who made it.

While this definition can be applied to all laws, human and divine, it surely applies most clearly to God's laws. God is pre-eminently the One Who has care and authority over all human beings, as is clear from the fact that He created them out of nothing. He knows what is good and necessary for them to reach the end for which He made them. He must express His will for them in a definite way, and that way is through laws.

It should be noted here, however, that the idea of law is not something that applies to human beings alone. There is a wider sense in which the term may be used. The widest sense is in respect to what is called the eternal law. This is the all-embracing plan or rule according to which God governs the whole universe which He has created. In the eternal law of God are included the laws governing the sun and moon and stars; the tides of the seas and the seasons of the year on earth; the chemicals and minerals and plants and animals to be found on earth. These things have no intelligence with which to know God's law; they obey it by a compulsion placed in their nature when it was created by God.

There are many things about the eternal law of God, that is, the manner in which He rules the whole universe toward the ends for which He

created it, that man cannot know. He cannot know, for example, how God will use accidental happenings, even tragic happenings, to fill out part of His over-all plan. But a part of the eternal law of God governs all such things.

When it comes, however, to what is necessary for man to know in order that he may reach his own destiny, God is bound by His own wisdom to reveal His laws to man. He made man intelligent; therefore He must rule man through his intelligence. He does that by making known to man's mind that part of His eternal law which places obligations on the free will that He gave him, that is to work in partnership with his mind.

Now, there are three ways in which God can make known to man that part of His eternal law which is necessary to direct him toward his destiny of eternal happiness.

First, God can speak to man, and tell him certain things that he must do to be saved, which things no man could know anything about unless God positively spoke of them. When God became man, He issued a certain number of such laws. He said, for example, you must be baptized in order to enter heaven. This, and other laws like it, are called positive divine laws. They come directly from God, and they could not be known without a positive statement of God.

Second, God can speak to man through other human beings to whom He has delegated some of His authority. Thus, fathers and mothers are delegated by God to guide their chil-

dren toward heaven, and therefore to make rules and laws for them. Rightfully elected or accepted civil officials are delegated by God to direct the citizens of their state toward their temporal welfare, and therefore to make just laws for them. The true Church was delegated by Christ to provide for the spiritual welfare of all His followers, and therefore to make laws for them. All laws made by delegates of God's authority, both in the spiritual and temporal order, become part of the eternal law of God, and a necessary means for the attainment of the destiny of man.

Third, God can speak to man silently, simply by revealing to his reason laws that He wrote into the very nature of man when He created it. Here we come to what is called "the natural law." This is what we must now look at in more careful detail.

II. THE NATURAL LAW

FIRST of all, let's look at a rather general principle that prepares our minds to understand the natural law.

Anybody who has the intelligence and ability to make or design an object that is to fulfill a certain purpose, writes laws into that object, many of which can be discovered merely by a close examination of the thing. Men can make things, not in the sense in which God creates things out of nothing, but in the sense that they assemble and combine materials into useful instruments, appliances, etc.

For example, the men in Detroit make automobiles. These automobiles have a very specific purpose,

namely, to carry people from place to place. Of course the makers put out a book of directions as to how the automobile must be used to fulfill its purpose. But even apart from the rule book, intelligent men can study the make-up of an automobile and learn through such study many of the laws that must be observed in its use. To be almost stupidly simple, one can thus learn that the steering wheel cannot be used as a brake; that a certain button must be turned or pulled to put on the headlights; that the doors can be opened only by pressing or turning the handle. These and many other laws can be learned by an examination of an automobile, and thus may in a sense be called the natural law of an automobile.

In exactly the same way it is possible for man to see or to learn many of the laws that God imposed upon his own nature when He created it. Only it is much more important that he grasp and keep these laws than that he learn what laws are to be kept in order to keep an automobile running. Man is immortal. His destiny or purpose is to be happy forever in heaven. Whatever laws God fixed into his nature and made intelligible by his reason have a definite relationship to his eternal happiness.

There are, then, two marks of the natural law through which God decreed that man would be directed toward his eternal happiness. The first is that it can be grasped by his intelligence; the second is that the evidence for it is built into the nature of man, so that by studying himself, man can know the primary and

fundamental principles or laws by which God expects him to live.

III. EXAMPLES OF THE NATURAL LAW

JUST as in examining the parts of an automobile or a watch or a washing machine or anything else, so in observing human nature one basic truth can be seen to underlie all the specific rulings of the natural law. It is this: any part of a thing that was clearly given a necessary purpose by the maker of the thing, must be used in accord with that purpose, if the whole thing is to attain its end.

Keep the analogy of the automobile in mind. You discover by studying it that the gas tank was put into it for the necessary purpose of holding gasoline. Pour water or oil or milk into that gas tank, and the car will never budge an inch; it cannot fulfill its purpose.

So, on a much higher level, and with much more serious, indeed eternal, consequences at stake, the parts or powers or faculties of man clearly designed by His Creator for necessary purposes must not be diverted from those purposes to something else. If any one of them is so diverted, the whole man is turned in the wrong direction, away from his real, eternal destiny, just as the automobile cannot possibly run with water in the gas tank.

What are some of these necessary purposes attached to parts or powers or faculties created in man? Take these three simple examples: the necessary purpose of speech, the necessary purpose of sex, the necessary purpose of life itself.

1. Clearly the necessary purpose of the power of speech, which God made part of man's nature, is to make possible honest business transactions, confident human cooperation, solid family and social life among human beings. These ends can be attained only if speech is used for telling the truth. If direct lying were ever permissible, then its very possibility would poison all human relations. Thus the very nature of the power of speech reveals God's voice, or the natural law, as saying: "Thou shalt not lie."

2. Clearly the powers of sex designed in human nature by God have one essential and necessary purpose. It is that of continuing the human race in the proper manner. It is obvious to reason that children can be properly born and reared only in the enduring state of marriage. In marriage the use of sex becomes good, virtuous, meritorious, even when children may not or cannot be conceived, so long as no direct action is taken to evade the necessary purpose of sex relations. On the same ground, any deliberate indulgence in sex actions or pleasure outside of marriage is contrary to the purpose God assigned to sex and therefore seriously wrong. This is a natural, therefore universal and unchangeable law.

3. Clearly God gives life to every human being whom He creates that he may use it, and every minute of it that God gives, to earn his eternal happiness with God. It is absolutely contrary to this purpose to cut short one's life by suicide, or to take un-

justly the life of someone else. It is even contrary to this purpose seriously to mutilate oneself, to deprive oneself of any important bodily part or power that shares in the whole life given by God, unless a diseased part must be excised to save the life as a whole. That is why direct sterilization is as contrary to the natural law as murder or suicide.

Thus it is with all prescriptions of the natural law. They arise from the perception of a necessary purpose attached to something that God made a part of human nature. Why are these laws so fixed and rigid and unchangeable? Just because they are attached irrevocably to human nature. God does not change the nature of things, once He has created them for a certain purpose. So He Himself cannot change the laws He attached to those natures.

IV. THE NEED OF AUTHORITY TO GUARD THE NATURAL LAW

JUST about here, someone is apt to be thinking: If, as you say, the natural moral law is so clear to reason, why is it not accepted as you explain it by all men? You say lying, contraception, masturbation, sterilization, etc., are contrary to the natural law and never permissible. How is it that so many people say that some or all of these things, are contrary to no law?

In answer to these questions, two important points must be made.

The first point is that one of the effects of original sin, if not counteracted by the proper spiritual measures, is "a weakening of the intel-

lect," that is, a tendency of the human mind to deny the most elementary truths out of pride, or passion, or self-will. Thus there are persons who deny even more basic and obvious truths than that of the binding force of the natural law. Some men deny the existence of God, though the evidence for it is all around them. Some deny that there is any such thing as truth, or that the human mind can know truth, or even that there is any such thing as a mind or intelligence in human beings. It need not be surprising, then, that such victims of the blindness of original sin will also deny that there is a universal natural law, or certain clear provisions of the natural law.

The second point is that God has gone to great lengths to cure the blindness that results from original sin.

It was for that very purpose that He became man. Through His life and sacrificial death He earned enough grace for mankind to offset, in anyone who accepts His grace, all the weakness of mind and will that were inherited with original sin.

He did more than that. He put much of the natural law into spoken words. We said above that God silently made known the natural law to man by giving him a mind that could study his own nature and perceive the laws imposed upon it by his Creator. But God knew that this would not be enough. So He also put much of the natural law into words backed by His omnipotent authority. Thus He stated repeatedly to His listeners these dictates of the natural

law: "Honor thy father and thy mother. Thou shalt not kill. Thou shalt not commit adultery. Thou shalt not steal. Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor."

Still more He did. He founded a Church that would be His own continuing voice in reiterating the natural law, and interpreting complex problems that arise in relation to it. The first and most general dictates of the natural law are quite easy for the human mind to grasp. But these first principles, easy to understand, have sometimes to be applied to exceedingly complicated situations. Christ did not want His followers to be left in doubt or confusion about right and wrong in complicated situations. He gave His Church authority to tell them how the natural law applies when their own minds are in doubt.

Sometimes such complications arise from a seeming conflict between two prescriptions of the natural law. For example, lying is clearly against the natural law. At the same time revealing secrets that would be harmful to others is also against the natural law. Thus a lie must not be told, and at the same time the truth must not be told. The Church, through her moral teachers, and sometimes by official declarations, clarifies the natural law for all her members in difficult matters of this kind.

But when a certain point of morality is clearly a matter of the natural law, that is, clear to reason as incorporated in the make-up of human beings, then the Church has no authority to make exceptions, or to change the law. She can only reaffirm it over and over; she can only offer motives

and graces through which the keeping of the hardest law is made easy.

CONCLUSION

THIS has been a brief explanation of what lies behind the often made statement: "Such and such an action can never be lawful, and no exceptions can be granted, because it is against the natural law." The natural law can no more be changed than the nature of man can be changed.

Laws that can be changed by the Church, or to which exceptions may

be granted by her, are called positive laws. Such laws are not written into human nature; they are made to help people keep the natural and divine law. Such are the laws governing fasting and abstaining on certain days, and before Communion; the laws governing the manner of entering a Christian marriage, etc. The Church can bind her children to these positive laws under pain of mortal sin. But she can also change them to adjust to changing circumstances. But she will never be found changing any part of the natural law.

THE HARVEST OF GOD

A little boy was given a bulb to plant, and was told if he put it in the ground it would grow, and by and by he would have a beautiful flower. He undertook the task with great delight, and promised blossoms to all his friends; but at the end of a week he came to his mother in sore disappointment. "The bulb isn't good for anything!" he said. "They told me it would grow and have pretty flowers, but it doesn't grow a bit, for I have dug it up every day to see."

Just such impatient gardeners are most of us in spiritual soil. We go to our Father with the old complaining cry: "We have served God and kept His ordinances, and what have we profited by it? The dishonest ones get ahead faster, the careless ones are happier. Where are the promised rewards of righteousness — the fruits of obedience?" But the harvests of God ripen slowly, and the seed which is sown in the earth finds its perfection above the earth. Sometime, somewhere, whatsoever we have sown we shall surely reap.

Catholic Young People's Friend

BEYOND THE BARRIER

One day, a weary Negro was plodding his way in search of suitable lodgings in the city of New York. He was heavily burdened by the two boxes he was carrying. Then a stranger passing by quietly offered: "Let me carry one, brother. I'm going your way." Later on, this Negro who became the famous Booker T. Washington admitted that it was with a good deal of reluctance that he allowed the other gentleman to help him with the boxes. "And that," said Booker T. Washington as he related the incident, "was the first time I ever met President Theodore Roosevelt."

The Way

DON'T

CARRY A

GRUDGE!

James Post, C.S.S.R.

NOTHING reveals more dramatically the weakness of the character of certain persons than the manner and frequency with which they carry grudges against relatives and friends and neighbors.

What Is a Grudge?

To bear a grudge means to show prolonged resentment against someone for some real or doubtful or imagined slight or offense that has been given.

Among children this is called "pouting," and in them it takes on many disagreeable forms. The adult can make pouting look more dignified and righteous; but it is still the same old disagreeable weakness.

No Lessons Needed

No one needs lessons on how to express a grudge. Instinctively weak people seem to know all the tricks. Some do it by a cold and

disdainful silence, by a refusal to answer questions except in uninterested monosyllables and a freezing aloofness from the plans and activities of the one who has awakened the grudge.

Some do it by sarcasm; by biting comments and caustic interpretations of another's conduct and words. Some do it by sadness; a showy sadness that cloaks the features, weighs down the shoulders and seems to say, "See what you have done to me!"

The longer a grudge lasts, the weaker is the character that supports it.

Questions To Ask

Strength of character means the ability to overcome resentment against others, to hide hurt feelings and to forgive readily and quickly. It is found in those who can honestly answer most of the following questions with a negative:

1. Am I sensitive and touchy in my dealings with others, quick to perceive slights and slurs and very slow to forget them?

2. Do I lack control over my features and bearing, so that the moment I am slighted or hurt I set myself into a certain appearance that reveals beyond all doubt that I have a grievance?

3. Do I frequently express exaggerated humility when others disagree with me, for example, by saying: "Of course, I have no education; I don't know anything. I am not capable of forming an opinion. You know it all."

4. Do I find myself dreaming about appropriate and devastating answers to people who have humiliated me, but expressing these answers only by a cool and hurt silence?

5. Do I make my friends apologize frequently and beg me not to be hurt by something they have said?

6. Have I spoiled parties and get-togethers by taking offense at some remark that was made and

by refusing to be congenial thereafter?

As Others See You

The grudge-bearing person usually considers himself so right that in his own judgment he is perfectly justified in his surly conduct. He will never be a strong character until he sees himself as others see him — as just a childish, pouting, self-opinionated weakling.

INTO THE FOLD

"At last the Catholic Church has come to me!"

This was the greeting we had from Theeanna when we knocked on the door of her tiny Suggsville, Alabama, home. It was rather astonishing to know you were representing the whole Church. Instinctively we sisters looked around, almost expecting to see the College of Cardinals behind us.

Theeanna explained that she had been teaching Sunday School in the Methodist church for years. "Every time I'd say the Apostles' Creed," she went on, "I'd tell myself, 'You're the biggest liar in these whole United States. If you believe in the Holy Ghost, the Holy Catholic Church, then what are you doing here in the Methodist church?'"

But the question Theeanna asked herself was not easy for her to answer. There was no sign of the Church in Suggsville nor for miles around. In fact, the only Catholic church Theeanna had ever seen or heard of was in Florida, many miles away, where some of her relatives lived.

Theeanna waited, and then one day, as she reports, "I was thinking about the good Lord and I heard a knock on my door. I said to myself, 'Who could be at my door this time of morning?' When I opened it I heard music to my ears. 'We are the Catholic sisters from Grove Hill.' 'Catholic sisters!' I said, 'At last the Catholic Church has come. Where have you been all these years?'"

Theeanna was the first convert in Suggsville. Now there is a Catholic church there, standing high on a hill as a beacon to welcome all who wish to enter.

The Missionary Catechist

FOUL FELONY!

A man in Tulsa, Oklahoma, didn't mind too much the loss of \$14 and some clothing taken from his home while he slept, but what really burned him up was that the burglar fed his watchdog two thick steaks from the refrigerator to keep him quiet.

"Extend your charity to all the world, if you would love Christ, because Christ's members are found all over the world." — St. Augustine

Charity Begins Abroad

LOUIS G. MILLER, C.SS.R.

THIS had been a "special collection" Sunday at St. Mary's, and there was a young priest, Father Pepler, on hand to preach his cause. He was a personable young man, blond, and sporting a modified crew cut, and he was a member of the Congregation of St. Benedict the Moor. I knew this religious society, many of whose members labored in remote and difficult areas of Africa, while others heroically spent themselves on whole counties of no-priest land in the southern United States.

As pastor of St. Mary's, I tried to give Father Pepler a warm welcome. To tell the truth, I was glad of his company, glad to warm my fading energies in the fire of enthusiasm which he manifested. He had accepted his assignment of preaching for the cause of the missions, realizing that it was necessary in order to obtain support for the missionaries. But it was not, he confessed, a task which came easy to him. What was close to his heart was to get into the mission field itself, to plunge into some forsaken

area of Africa and get on with the work. But his superiors remained deaf to his appeals, and so here he was, he said, "fat-catting it at home."

Father Pepler's appeal to the people had been a stirring one, and I could tell by glancing at the collection baskets that their response had been generous.

"You did well, and I'm glad of it," I told him, as we sat down to a cup of coffee after the last Mass.

"Thanks, Father," he said. "You don't think I hurt your own collection?"

"I'm sure you didn't. My experience is that when people have a chance to show their generosity in a worthy cause such as you represent the parish collection is likely to be even larger on that day."

"Well, I'm glad to hear that, believe me. I've found that people sometimes aren't too sympathetic to appeals for the foreign missions."

It was at this juncture that I heard the kitchen door open and recognized the voice of Finbar O'Houlihan as he said hello to my housekeeper, Mrs. Ronan. An inspiration seized me.

"Finbar!" I called out. "Come in here and meet Father Pepler."

Mr. O'Houlihan, I might explain, was my unofficial janitor and jack-of-all-trades at St. Mary's, a man of limited education, but native shrewdness and wide-ranging opinions on all conceivable subjects. With his short stature, bald head, and bow legs, he could easily have contended for last place in a beauty sweepstakes, but this detracted not a whit from my affection and respect for him.

"Finbar," I said, "you have your finger on the public pulse. Have you heard any objections to an appeal for the foreign missions such as we had today?"

Finbar took only five seconds to collect his thoughts.

"Begging your pardon, Father," he replied, with a bow to the young priest, "I must confess I have."

"What were they?" asked Father Pepler.

"Well, I'll tell you," said Finbar. "I heard two parishioners talking in Grogan's bar, where I stopped last night just to pass the time of day, you understand. And one of them said, 'I hear Pat Flaherty's boy—the one that's a priest — is sailing off to Africa as a missionary.' And the other said: 'Yes, and I don't understand it. They tell me they could use a lot of priests in many parts of our own country. Why send them off to the other side of the world?' That's what they said, if you want the truth of it."

The young priest rose to Finbar's challenge, his face a little flushed with excitement.

"I'll tell you why," he said. "It's because Christ told the apostles: 'Go forth and teach *all* nations,' not just one nation. There was a lot of work waiting to be done in their own Jewish nation, but He didn't tell them to stay there; He said they should scatter themselves and spread themselves far and near, and that's exactly what they did; they kept moving from one country to the next, preaching the Gospel everywhere until they died. It's true there *is* much to be done here at home, and the need for priests is great. But there are parts of the world where the need is even greater, because the people haven't had even their initial chance to hear the good news of the Gospel."

"True for you and well put," said Finbar. But I could see that Father Pepler scarcely heard him. He had produced from his pocket a booklet, which he waved in Finbar's face.

"This is the Holy Father's encyclical letter *Fidei Donum*," he said. "You heard me quote from it at Mass this morning; it's all about the missions in Africa. Here is what the pope says on this very point: 'Zeal for missionary activity and the Catholic spirit are one and the same. . . Nothing is so inconsistent with the Church of Jesus Christ as division; nothing is so opposed to her very life as for her members to take refuge in selfish solitude, or to be too much devoted to themselves so as to take an interest only in the private concerns of their own little group. Such an attitude surely causes any particular Christian community to become completely self-centered.'"

"Yes," said Finbar, "but if I'm to play the role of devil's advocate, let me play it to the hilt. Isn't it true that the more young priests are sent away to other countries, the more our own people suffer from a shortage of priests?"

"Let me quote from the Holy Father's letter again, Mr. O'Houlihan. He is well aware of the objection you raise, and this is his answer: 'Dioceses that are suffering from such a shortage of priests should not therefore close their ears to Our supplications for help on the foreign missions. If a poor diocese helps another poor diocese, it cannot possibly grow poorer in so doing; God does not allow Himself to be outdone in generosity.'"

Father Pepler paused for breath, and I poured him another cup of coffee, and one for Finbar.

"You certainly have boned up on what the pope has to say," I remarked.

"He's tremendous!" my visitor replied. "His breadth of vision along with his deep learning are enough to make anyone feel pretty small by comparison."

"Now coming back to the point at issue," said Finbar, who was thoroughly enjoying himself. "Isn't it true that some of these foreign missionaries don't make much headway in their work? I've heard of some of them in India and Siam and some of those places who worked for years, and maybe ended up with a mere handful of converts from paganism. Isn't that a waste of money and manpower?"

"Not at all and far from it," the young priest answered. "Christ commanded that the worldwide preaching be done; He didn't say that always and everywhere it would meet with an immediate response. Sometimes the seed of the Gospel springs up and bears fruit immediately; then again it takes many years for it to show much growth. But when it does finally begin to grow, those who tend the harvest must in all honesty give credit to the ones who planted the seed in the first place. Remember what St. Paul wrote: 'I have planted, Apollo watered, but God gave the increase.'"

"Do you mean that you would be able to resign yourself to working in some corner of the world where you never saw any immediate results of your work?"

"It would be hard, but I would try to keep working and hoping and praying. There was a great French missionary, Charles de Foucauld, who went deep into the Sahara desert and lived there for years and years among the Mohammedan tribesmen without making one single convert. Finally they shot him like a dog and left him to die. Useless, you say? Yet it may well be that the great flowering of the faith which is taking place in Africa today is due to his hidden sacrifices and prayers so many years ago."

"And even if the people showed no appreciation of your efforts, and hung up signs 'Yankee, go home!' you would stick with it?"

"Let's put it this way, that I hope I would have the courage to stick

with it. You mentioned the signs 'Yankee, go home!' that are not uncommon in some countries. I hope that as a good missionary I could win the respect and love of the people for me even as a Yankee. But more than that and deeper than that, I would want to stick with it because I don't believe that any really convinced Christian can be content until he has done whatever he can do to bring every part of the world to the knowledge and love of Christ. As the pope says, quoting St. Augustine: 'Extend your charity to all the world, if you would love Christ, because Christ's members are found all over the world.'

Even Finbar was silent for a moment after such a speech, made without a trace of self-consciousness. But he could not be silent very long.

"That was downright eloquent, Father," he said. "Father Tom Burke himself couldn't have done better. If the next missionary who comes here to appeal for funds is half as good, who knows, he might have me dipping into my private gold reserve."

"I hope so, Mr. O'Houlihan, because I've got one last quotation to throw at you on this subject of financial support of the missions. Here is what the Holy Father says:

'How many good works some missionary, now hindered in his apostolic labors by poverty, might not accomplish with the money not infrequently squandered on fleeting enjoyment by some thoughtless Christian! It behooves every child of the Church, every family, every group of Christians to examine themselves dil-

igently on this point. Let them reflect on these words: you know the graciousness of our Lord Jesus Christ, how being rich, He became poor for your sakes, that by His poverty you might become rich. Then let them set aside some of their superfluities, nay at times, something of what they need. Remember that in your charity are found the means whereby the boundaries of religion may be broadened; and the face of the earth will be renewed if charity prevails.'

"I can resist no longer," said Finbar. "Here's ten dollars to go with my earlier contribution. I was saving it to buy myself a green vest for the St. Patrick's day parade. But I'll walk in orange if it will help the missions."

"Your name doesn't sound Irish, Father Pepler," I added, "but if you know your colors, you'll recognize that as nothing less than the supreme sacrifice."

"Not to mention," said Finbar, "that I'd get killed doing it."

NO DOUBT WHATEVER

The screen door had inadvertently been left open all morning, and the young couple were busily swatting flies. "How many did you get?" the wife asked, pausing for a moment.

"Eight," answered the husband. "Four males and four females."

"Four males and — what?" she exclaimed. "How could you tell the males from the females?"

"Easiest thing in the world," grinned her husband. "Four were on the sugar bowl — and four on the mirror."

Great Northern Goat

Problems of Professional People

Is Organic Transplantation Allowed?

PROBLEM: In recent years surgery has made wonderful progress, especially in the field of organic transplantation (from one person to another), including blood transfusions, skin grafts, and even the transfer of the cornea of an eye or of a kidney. What is to be said of the morality of such procedures?

SOLUTION: An adequate response to this problem requires several distinctions. In the first place, it can be limited to the question whether it is permissible to transfer to a living person a portion of a human corpse. Most people would be surprised to learn that this procedure offers any moral difficulty; yet, in a speech delivered in 1956, Pope Pius XII implied that some moralists were opposed to such a mode of transplantation because of the sanctity of the human body even after death. However, the pope himself stated that there is no moral objection to such a process. He was speaking particularly of the transplantation of the cornea of an eye from one who has recently died to a living person who can probably profit by it.

Secondly, all Catholic theologians agree that a living person may lawfully give another individual a blood transfusion or a skin graft. This procedure is not a mutilation of the donor's body in the strict sense, since the portion of blood or of skin thus given is subsequently restored by nature.

Thirdly, when there is question of the transfer from one living person to another of a part of the body that will not be restored, such as an eye or a kidney, Catholic theologians are not in agreement.

Some believe that, just as a person would not be permitted to kill himself directly for the benefit of another, so he may not allow himself to be mutilated, even when the purpose is to aid a fellow human being. These theologians argue that man's body belongs to God, and there is no reason to believe that God has granted man the right to injure it deliberately except when such a procedure is necessary for the health of the entire body.

However, other theologians believe that God does not forbid organic transplantations, with certain qualifications. The donor must consent to the operation, and it must be one that will not seriously endanger his life or permanently cripple him. According to these theologians, the transplantation of an eye or of a kidney from one living person to another would be permissible. This opinion has sufficient weight to be safely followed in conscience by a Catholic, and a doctor would be allowed to participate in such an operation, especially since Pope Pius XII, in the address referred to previously, stated that it is not his wish to give any decision on the matter as yet.

Fourthly, it is permitted to transfer portions of a living animal to a human being, if a transplantation of this kind is judged to be beneficial. The pope also asserted the lawfulness of this procedure. However, he added the important point that it would never be allowed to transfer the sex glands of an animal to a human being.

Very Rev. Francis J. Connell,
C.S.S.R., S.T.D., LL.D., L.H.D.,
Catholic University of America

FEATURE LETTER

A Housewife Looks at Marriage and the Priesthood

IT WAS a glorious June evening; balmy, fresh and delightfully suited for a wedding reception. The reception we were attending was not the usual one. It was the wedding of a young man with God — an ordination.

As we approached the church hall, I explained to our four-year-old the procedure of the blessing, telling her that one knelt before the priest and, after the blessing, kissed his hands. The kneeling was not questioned, but the kissing of the hands caused some perplexity.

"Why must I kiss his hands, mama?"

This was about the 100th puzzler I had received during the day, but somehow (divine grace, I surmise) I managed to answer.

"A priest," I explained, "is dear Jesus' very special helper. Surely if we were to meet dear Jesus, we would kiss His hands. Since He is in heaven, and we cannot kiss His hands, we kiss the priest's hands instead."

This answer seemed to be accepted, and I breathed a sigh of relief. Then, as we reached the top of the steps, puzzler number 101 blasted off the launching pad.

Said she, "Well, aren't I dear Jesus' helper, too?"

As childlike and naive as this half-statement, half-question was, it sparked a good deal of thinking on my part as to the responsibilities of the lay individual and this led me to the reflection of the great similarity between the sacraments of holy orders and matrimony. This I say in all humility, being cognizant of the fact that holy orders is indeed of a higher rank and bestows powers and graces which are naturally denied the laity. However, my line of thinking concerned principally the vows or obligations taken by priests; namely, those of diocesan priests, chastity and obedience, and a third taken by those of religious orders, poverty.

A day or two later I picked up the June copy of THE LIGUORIAN (my first, I might add) and read with avid interest the letters in Readers Retort regarding birth prevention versus abstinence. The thing that intrigued me particularly was the blasting the clergy received for their "unrealistic, complacent, pious" attitudes concerning the problem of birth prevention.

Before I go any further, I'd better pause for a few words about myself. By this time there are probably many readers who are saying to themselves, "Now here is a real sanctimonious Sal, who wouldn't know Marlon Brando from Ethel Barrymore. She is undoubtedly some solemn-faced, black-garbed holier-than-thou who trots about distributing religious tracts and compensates for a lack of personal charm with a lot of religious fol-de-rol." Not so!

Although I've never been asked to parade down the boardwalk at Atlantic City, my friends (and this is why they are my friends) term me attractive. I know how to use make-up to attain the desired effect. I'm acquainted with the chemise and the sack and the trapeze look. I have occasional coffee-klatches with the "girls." I've read Farrell, Faulkner, Steinbeck, Hemingway, Jones and Tennessee Williams' plays. I've been to formals, cocktail parties, weenie roasts, and the theatre. I was a student-waitress, typist, secretary and public school teacher. I became engaged, married and am the mother of two children. I am no cold tomato. I am of this world, believe me.

Now back to those vows. And when I use the word "vow," I want the meaning to be broadened to include the acceptance of an obligation.

Let's start with obedience. While a priest takes a vow of obedience, of essence to God and his religious superior, we, as individuals, Christians, Catholics, and married persons, must

by divine decree take a vow of obedience to God. This means we must adhere to His Word and keep His commandments — not merely the word of the bishop or the parish priest as a fellow human being (although for the life of me, I can't understand how some people can ascribe such dogmatic preachings to men whom they describe as those who "drive good cars, smoke, drink, live in good houses . . . have no more worries than whether the car will start when they want to go for a ride." Surely, persons of this sort would have to do their "brow-beating" from behind the wheel of their cars, drive-in style).

The law of God forbids onanism (Genesis 38:10), and reason condemns birth prevention. This is logic, this is religion, this is God's word.

May I also add what Scripture tells us, in regard to *priests*? "With all thy soul fear the Lord and reverence His priests." (Ecclesiasticus 7:31) and, "He who receives you, receives me; and who receives me, receives him who sent me." (Matthew 10:40)

If we believe in Jesus, we believe in His word. His priests are our guides, helping us to know His word and constantly reminding us of it. The priests didn't make up the rules of the game. They were not born as babes wearing Roman collars and a pious expression; they were not reared in a snug, warm, celestial atmosphere. Most of them came from *our* income bracket. They've cried, done without, worked and "made do" as we have, but likely as not, they com-

pared their tribulations to Calvary and blushed.

To obey God's word, to concede to His divine plan, to submit to His divine will, to realize our inadequacy in the face of His supreme intelligence — this is our vow. Matrimony and holy orders? Surely, there is similarity in that point of obedience.

Secondly comes the vow of poverty. If we obey God's word, if we "increase and multiply and fill the earth," chances are we won't be driving a Cadillac or eating steak even once a week. I've washed diapers by hand, worn runs on the *inside* so that they would not show, collected recipes on "1001 Ways to Cook Hamburger," lived in crowded apartments (but what good Canasta games we had there!) and probably *never* will own a mink stole, or more than one pair of decent shoes at a time. But with the blessed saint (and I regret to say I do not remember which one said it) I have often repeated, "How will this look in the face of eternity?" Funny how things can fall back into perspective with this thought in mind!

Yes, I've seen the bills. Yet, somehow, it has never occurred to me to present them "to the holy persons at the nearest rectory." I chose the married life with my eyes wide open.

A funny thought (ridiculous is a better word) just occurred to me. How would some of these "downtrodden" react if the clergy were to present them with a bill "to compensate for the loss of sexual pleasure (which they, the 'downtrodden,' regard as

the utmost in importance) through denial for the benefit of the laity?"

Which leads to the last point — chastity. This one is loaded!

A while back I said I was the mother of two children. Undoubtedly those with six or seven have discontinued reading, or are now sitting back with a smug "What does *she* have to complain about?" look on their face.

Yes, we have two. I hope we will be able to have more. When our first was born, my husband was a part-time student, working full time and on the very bottom rung of the ladder. We never knew such happiness as that little girl brought us. However, we knew that another at that time would be financially impossible. Abstinence was the only answer.

So, with God's grace, we found that chastity in marriage is neither unnatural nor impossible. After all, is not "moderation in all things" a good rule for all phases of life?

It may come as a shock, but God urges all to remain chaste.

"But I say to the unmarried and to widows, it is good for them if they so remain, even as I. But if they do not have self-control, let them marry, for it is better to marry than to burn." (1 Corinthians 7:8-9)

God is not cruel. He sends compensations and rewards richly. He gives us tools with which to do our appointed tasks.

As God gave us the power to become parents, He also gave us our intellects. Psychologists tell us that when we stop to analyze the symp-

toms of an emotion, the emotion dissolves. Try it next time you find yourself doing a slow burn. Your anger will disappear before you know it. This is also a successful method in more pleasurable emotions.

We also know that there is no real happiness without preceding denial. A holiday means nothing to one who does not have to work. A turkey dinner holds no appeal to one who has already eaten. Self-denial and abstinence can pave the way to true joy.

Forget what the Kinsey report has to say about the average frequency of intercourse. Overlook the popular notion (widespread in modern fiction) that the true test of masculinity is the inability to resist "irresistible urges." Was anyone ever more masculine than our Lord on Good Friday?

Somehow I have the feeling that on judgment day our Lord is not going to consult the statistics in the Kinsey report. He might, however, remind us that He provided us with a body, a spirit, an intellect and a free will. He gave us pretty good odds (3 to 1), and He expects us to use them in the right way.

We now have our second little girl. We've worked for her, hoped for her, planned for her. We love and appreciate her.

Obedience, poverty, and chastity! These are the Big Three of life.

Priests are God's very special helpers, and we, the laity, the average, middle-income married, are God's helpers in a very special way too!

Mrs. E. L. F.

TEEN-AGER IN ACTION

Last March in a large Midwest city an 11th grader felt bad about the way things were going on his block. A couple of families were hardly speaking when they met on the street. There were two families that didn't go to Mass on Sunday unless it was very convenient, which wasn't often. Another set of families were shaking fists at each other about a misplaced fence. And three families had invalids whom the neighbors didn't have time to visit.

This teen-ager decided to do something about the whole, cold mess. He had heard about the "block rosary" at school and how it sometimes changed the whole attitude of the block. He thought he'd give it a try.

So, he started to ring doorbells. "Yes, we'd be glad to come. You say every Wednesday evening at 7:15 to pray for peace and for Russia? We'll be there."

Another said: "No, I'm sorry. My husband works nights and I have to stay home with the baby, but I'd like to . . . I can bring the baby? Well, maybe."

The first Wednesday night there were present seven families out of twenty. They were all a little embarrassed at first. The teen-ager led the rosary; the others were afraid they'd forget.

That was a year ago. Today there are only two more families in the group, but it is very closely bound together by Mary's rosary. People know each other and meet with a smile and visit and help take care of each other's sick, and the quarrels are being patched up. It's slow work. But even the slowest to come think it is well worthwhile.

Indiana Catholic and Record

WHAT DO YOU BELIEVE?

"God Is the One and Only

ONCE we know and believe that God exists, the question naturally comes to our mind, "Who is God?"

The truly adequate answer to that question can only come from God Himself, because only God can know Himself as He really is. Only God Himself can grasp the idea of God. Even the angels, pure spirits that they are, find it impossible to explain completely who and what God is, and we human beings were made "a little less than the angels." The nature of God exceeds all bounds of human knowledge.

When we speak of God, so weak and inadequate are the words with which we must dress our ideas, that we seem to stammer and lisp as little children just learning to speak.

God Himself told us who He is. When Moses was tending his sheep near Mount Horeb, God appeared to him in the flames of a burning bush and told him he was to free his people from the slavery of the Egyptians.

Moses in answer said to God: "Behold I will go to the children of Israel and I will say to them: 'The God of your fathers hath sent me to you!' And if they should say to me: 'What is His name?' What shall I say to them?"

Perfect Being!"

JOSEPH D. ELWORTHY, C.SS.R.

God said to Moses: "I AM WHO AM. Thus shalt thou say to the children of Israel: HE WHO IS, hath sent me to you!" (Ex. 3:13-14)

This name, HE WHO IS, belongs to God alone. Only He is the most perfect being, without flaw and without equal. God alone can truthfully say that all that He is and all that He has, He owes to Himself. Only God can say that He is without beginning, without end; that He has no imperfections; that He is unchangeable.

In order to understand more fully what God meant when He said, "I AM WHO AM," let us look at His creatures and from them, let us ascend to their Creator.

GOD IS INTELLIGENCE WITHOUT BOUNDS

HUMAN beings are different from all other earthly creatures inasmuch as they possess intelligence

and free will. There are two and a half billion human creatures on earth today. How many billions have preceded them? How many more still to come?

Above us in the order of creation are the angels, pure spirits without mixture of matter. How clear and bright is the intelligence of the angels! They have no bodies, as we do, no bodily senses; their pure intellect helps them to see the nature of things without going through the complicated process that produces our thought.

There are billions of angels and billions of men. Add up all the intelligence they possess together — and it can be added up! It includes all the great thinkers of today and of times past: Einstein, Pascal, St. Thomas, St. Augustine, Plato, and Aristotle. All this human and angelic intelligence together does not even begin faintly to approach the intelligence without measure that is God's.

God knows and sees all things in the most perfect manner. God knows us in every tissue and bone and artery of our body. God knows all the secrets of our soul. He sees everything as it is.

GOD IS LIFE

WHAT a marvel is this life we possess and share with billions of men! In a lesser degree even the animals that roam the forests and the plants that brighten the landscape share this mysterious power which we call life.

The greatest scientific minds have tried to understand completely this mystery of life. They have put living organisms under the microscope; they have carefully separated the different chemicals that make up a living body; they have spent long nights and days in research. Yet the more they discover about life the more humble do they become in the realization of how little they really know.

All life — human, animal, and plant — on this earth comes from God. All life here below is but the faintest image of the eternal life that God Himself not only possesses, but is. With God there is no beginning, no end, no past, no future, no time, nor is He subject to any change whatsoever.

GOD IS ALL BEAUTY

WE THRILL to the beauty of a sunset on the hills, the rugged coastline of the Pacific Northwest, the majestic mountains of Colorado. Our eyes are delighted with the paintings of the master artists, our ears with the harmonies of talented musical composers, with the measured lines of famous poets.

Yes, there is much beauty here on earth. And there is even more beauty in heaven. And all heaven's beauty, and earth's too, comes from the Supreme Artist, God. God is all beauty, far beyond our ability to imagine.

GOD CAN DO ALL THINGS

WHAT force there is in the visible world! The stars and sun and moon race through the heavens.

What energy is found in man, as even now he begins to explore the almost limitless power of the atom and point his rocket ships to the moon!

All this force and energy is created, proceeding from God's own hand. All things are in His power to do — just by one act of His almighty will. And with God there is no need of material that existed before. He said, "Let there be light," and behold, light was made.

GOD IS WISDOM

RIIGHTLY do we admire those parents who lead their families prudently through life, the statesmen who guide their countries successfully through trying times, and popes who wisely govern the Church through bitter and drawn-out persecution.

We envy the knowledge of the angels who see things in a flash of intuitive vision.

Yet all the knowledge of the angels and men together is as but a tiny droplet of water lost in the immense ocean of God's own wisdom.

All knowledge, all wisdom comes from God, and no one can possess even the tiniest part of it unless it comes from God. God is wisdom unlimited, Who rules and governs all, Who firmly but gently, without error, leads all creation to the end for which He created it.

GOD IS GOODNESS

AMOTHER looking at the baby in her arms, a nun washing the foul sores of a leprous patient, a St. Vincent de Paul ministering to the

needs of the sick poor — from such as these goodness seems to radiate.

All the goodness of men from the dim past, until now and for evermore, added together, does not even begin to compare with the infinite goodness of God.

God is love, without imperfection, without bounds, without end.

GOD IS ALL HOLY

MARY, God's own mother, is the holiest of creatures. Yet all her sanctity, plus the holiness of St. Joseph, the angels, the apostles, martyrs, confessors and virgins, is as nothing in comparison with the sanctity of God. The holiness of God's creatures is but a dim shadow, a faint reflection of the majestic sanctity of God.

All the perfections that shine forth in creatures, God possesses in a way far surpassing their sum total. There is nothing of defect, or error, or imperfection in Him.

God is the purest and most perfect being.

We are accustomed to say that a fellow human being is good, is true, is wise, is holy. God does not just possess these perfections; He is all goodness, all truth, all wisdom, all holiness.

Only God can plumb the depths of meaning behind His cry: "I AM WHO AM!"

Practice: See God's goodness and beauty and wisdom reflected in moving fields of wheat or grass, in a sunset resting on the hills, in a great-souled man.



Problems of Single People

Donald F. Miller, C.S.S.R.

Sanctifying Your Job

THE major part of the life of a single person living in the world is the job or profession or career by which he or she makes a living. Five days a week, usually from eight to five, that is what has to be concentrated on. In the case of those who are keeping house for brothers or sisters or other relatives, it may even be a seven-days-a-week responsibility. But whatever the work is, a mental attitude toward it should be cultivated that will make it spiritually fruitful. Indeed, one of the great dangers of single people is that they may separate their working hours completely from their attempts to lead good spiritual lives.

Spiritualizing a job means learning to look upon it in relation to God's will, God's commands, and the opportunities it provides for doing things for God.

That all of us must work at something is a command given by God.

"In the sweat of thy face," He said to Adam after his fall into sin, "thou shalt eat bread till thou return to the earth out of which thou wast taken." (Genesis, 3:19) St. Paul said: "If any man will not work, neither let him eat." (2 Thessalonians, 3:10) Thus the single person, plodding off to his job each day, riding the same old bus or streetcar, or driving through the same familiar streets, should be heartened by the thought that he is obeying a universal command of God.

The one keeping house for a family should rise to the familiar tasks of preparing meals, cleaning, making beds, shopping etc., should inspire herself with the same thought.

Moreover, the very kind of job one has should be looked upon at any given time as dictated by the providence of God. Providence works through the free wills of human beings, and thus cogent reasons may often arise for electing to change jobs. But there is always a powerful element of God's choice and God's direction in placing a particular person in a particular job at a given time. One's job may have many unpleasant features. It may be entirely different from the kind of work a person once dreamed of doing. One may even feel "trapped" in a certain job, not liking what he has to do, and yet not being in a position to change jobs with ease and sound hope of security. Truly, however, there is no such thing as being "trapped" in the unpleasant sense of the word. Instead of thinking in such terms, a single person should say: "This job is God's will for me now. I'll keep my eyes open for something better. But while I am here, I'll do my work just as if it were God Himself Who hired me for this piece of work in the world."

FINALLY, every job should be looked upon, not merely in a material way, but as affording wonderful opportunities for spiritual achievement. These pieces are being written primarily for

Christians, for people who want to be better Christians. Is there any job in the world today that does not give one an opportunity for helping others at the very least by good example? "Let your light shine before men," said Christ to His followers, "that they may see your good works and glorify your Father Who is in heaven." Not that He meant that any Christian should ever be good merely to impress others. But he should be mindful that if he is good for the love of God, if he is living in sanctifying grace, if he is trying to grow in all virtues, his example will influence others to turn to God. There are few jobs that do not throw one into daily contact with others, some pagan, some lapsed from the faith, some morally degenerate. The example of a good Christian in their midst is often the beginning of their thinking seriously about their own duties to God.

Silent example is powerful, but it is not the only opportunity for spiritual achievement offered to single people at their jobs. Without "preachiness" they can speak of what they believe, especially in answer to sincere questions; they can suggest reading matter to associates; they can sometimes invite them to church services and special sermons; they can offer true Christian sympathy and comfort to those who are troubled and bereaved.

Life is too short for anyone to waste the spiritual opportunities afforded him by his job. How much better the world would be, how much more quickly turned to Christ, if every Christian looked upon his (or her) job not merely as a pay-check, or as time put in, but as an opportunity for doing something of eternal value for others.

THE NEW MENTAL DISCIPLINE

Of all the things that go under the name of EDUCATION nowadays, the latest circular inviting St. Paul parents "to have fun learning" takes the prize!

Issued by the St. Paul public schools, this circular urges parents "to enjoy adult education."

Some of the "education courses" offered are: bridge, budgets, cake decorating, car care, dancing, driver education, fishing clinic, fly casting, fly tying, furniture refinishing, golf, gourmet cookery, personal grooming, "slimnastics" (?), streamlining the figure, etc.

This "education program" is sponsored by the Board of Education. It promises participants a "night life that leads to a brighter tomorrow."

The board does not define "education." Webster does. He defines it thus: "The act or process of educating; the result of educating as determined by the knowledge, skill, or discipline of character acquired. Implies not so much the communication of knowledge as the discipline of the intellect, the establishment of the principles and the regulation of the heart."

Wonder how "slimnastics," car care and fishing clinics fit in with the "discipline of character," "the discipline of the intellect" and the "establishment of principles." Perhaps the Board of Education can enlighten us?

The Wanderer

No one can be so poor that he cannot give alms to the holy souls.

Father Faber

Objections

to

Christ

Not only unbelievers—even some of His faithful followers seem to think that Jesus Christ is too vague a figure to be the object of honest human love.

IN ALL history, ancient and modern, sacred or profane, there has never been an individual who was so intensely loved, by so many, with such extraordinary effects, as Jesus Christ.

Some months ago an article in THE LIGUORIAN took this startling statement for a kind of text and, on examining it point by point, found it startlingly true.

In the course of the article, however, it was mentioned that there are those who object to the idea of Christ as the great lover of history. Unbelievers, naturally, view it with resentment, or sometimes with violence. Some even among the faithful there are who find it hard to take.

Let us now examine these objectors and some of their objections.

In the late 1940's a book was published dealing with the "Best Sellers" of the previous fifty years. Among these best sellers there happened to

RAYMOND J. MILLER, C.SS.R.

be several that were lives of Christ, or studies of His character in one way or another.

One of the reviewers of the book, a writer in the liberal weekly *The New Leader*, while dealing with most of the book in a routine fashion, could not conceal his mystification at thus finding Christ among the best sellers. He even showed irritation. "What is this man doing here?" seemed to be the resentful question in his mind. "What business has that shadowy Galilean in the field of modern literature?"

Yet, despite the reviewer's resentment it was and still is a fact that the personality of Christ commands attention even in the modern pagan world. Resentment on the part of the unbeliever does not invalidate the vast reality of the appeal, but only serves to focus still more at-

tention on the monumental fact that Jesus Christ occupies an altogether unique position in human history, even in the literature of the western world.

About the same time that this review appeared, there occurred another objection to the personality of Christ. This time it was in Mexico City, during a session of the National Congress. A congressman who was a good practical Catholic (a rare apparition in that congress, even though the population of the country is more than ninety per cent Catholic) delivered an address in which he declared, in effect: "Mexico is a Catholic country. And until the day when the holy name of God is again publicly respected in our land, and the sacred person of Jesus Christ receives the honor that is His due in a Christian nation, Mexico may expect no relief from the ills that have beset the nation for the last hundred and fifty years."

It was a brave thing to say in that gathering of apostates and active enemies of all religion. The reaction was not slow in coming. Another congressman, according to the newspaper account of the incident, rose at once to demand the floor. In fact, he made his way to the very front of the chamber, and there cried out in accents of frenzy: "By what right does the congressman bring *that name* into this assembly?"

As though it were the name of a personal foe, one still actively at work plaguing him with vile plots of injustice; instead of being "that

name" of a Man Who, according to the professed belief of the unbeliever, had died a failure two thousand years ago, or perhaps had never lived at all!

Again, it was an objection that by its very nature "bore witness to Christ." No other name, ancient or modern, sacred or profane, uttered in that assembly, could have called forth from the lips of the unbeliever so violent a denunciation, so ringing a testimonial to the reality of Jesus Christ even in the politics of the modern world.

OR PERHAPS we should say that while it is true that He is unique in history as being loved by more persons, more intensely, more dramatically and demonstratively than any other human being, ancient or modern, sacred or profane, it is also true that there is no character in all history, ancient or modern, sacred or profane, legendary or literary or literal, who has been so hated, and hated by so many, hated so intensely, and with such diabolical manifestations, as Jesus Christ.

What is to be said of such a person? His enemies themselves bear witness to His extraordinary power to attract or repel. The very objections to His claims, or to His position in history, rise up to range themselves as evidence of His unique vitality.

But not only the unbelievers and enemies of Christ object to His being honored and loved; even some of the faithful shrink from thinking of Him as being the object of human love more than any other person in

history. They find it embarrassing; and to be perfectly honest, they would say that the love of Christ is not really "love" at all, but (to be perfectly honest) only a kind of pious make-believe. Christ is too vague a figure to be the object of honest human love; too weak and watery, too pious and religious, too lacking in the definiteness of character that constitutes personal charm; too much the preacher of obvious moral platitudes.

These objections can be very honest, but they are all based on ignorance. If it is embarrassing to think of Christ and real "love" together, it is His own fault, for He was always talking about love. If a Christian thinks otherwise, he does not know his Gospel. If he thinks he has to play some pious make-believe game, or go against his better judgment when he speaks or thinks of loving Christ, he does not know his Christ, and he does not know the meaning of true love either. And if he thinks of Christ as weak and watery and the rest, he will have a hard time explaining why this weak and shadowy figure has attracted such ardent devotion to Himself and has been hated with such blood-thirsty fury, in His own lifetime and down through two thousand years of human history.

Christ was always talking about love, demanding love for Himself:

Abide in My love: live on in My love;
be sure to hold My love; keep loving
Me!

On one occasion He said to Peter:
Simon, son of John, do you love Me?

When Peter replied that he did, Christ repeated the question:

Simon, son of John, do you love Me?

Peter replied again that he did; but Christ repeated the question a third time:

Simon, son of John, do you love Me more than these do?

In one way (and it is well to stress the fact, even at the risk of seeming irreverent, in order to get the true perspective on this thing of the love demanded by Jesus Christ) it could seem that our divine Lord was here talking like a sentimental schoolgirl, repeating, "Do you love Me?" over and over.

On another occasion He was addressing the multitudes, and cried:

If any man love father and mother more than Me, he is not worthy of Me!

Suppose, on that occasion, that we happened to be strangers in Galilee, passing by as this itinerant Preacher was uttering these extraordinary words. Certainly we should have been amazed and stopped to stare at the Man Who dared to demand "love" so supreme and exclusive for Himself.

The unbeliever and the embarrassed Catholic may grant that our Lord did speak frequently of love; but their doubts and objections would not be completely satisfied. What He was talking about, what He was demanding under the name of "love" (they cannot help feeling)

is not exactly the real thing. It is rather a pious make-believe; doing distasteful religious things, dry-as-dust drudgery, and calling it love.

Yet there is the unmistakable fact that if there was one thing Jesus Christ hated in religious things, it was any kind of make-believe. He denounced the Scribes and Pharisees in the most ringing and even lurid terms precisely because the kind of love they were offering to God was nothing but a pious make-believe.

AND as to the distasteful things, the dry-as-dust drudgery, is it not a kind of maxim or proverb even in ordinary human life that "the course of true love never runs smooth?" In folklore and fairy stories (so close to the heart of humanity, as Chesterton, the great English convert, has said), the prince has to scale the dangerous mountain, or slay the dragon, or serve in toilsome bondage for years, until finally, if he has been faithful in the time of darkness and drudgery, "they are married and live happily ever after."

So in the case of the love of God, it is no objection to say that in this world it lacks the ecstasy of true love. This world is not the place for that ecstasy (except for the "ecstasies"), but the place for proving the lover's constancy in trouble and trial. If he is faithful and proves it, then infallibly *the ecstasy will come*. Every person in heaven is completely in love with God, infatuated with the infinitely lovely and loving Lover to an extent surpassing anything in earthly experience, or all human experiences put together; and there,

after the time of testing true love in this world, he and his divine Lover quite literally "live happily ever after."

Except for the ecstasies! Even in this world, there are cases of souls to whom God gives a foretaste of the ecstasy of heaven. They are called "ecstasies" or "mystics;" and their experiences, even in this world, surpass all the glad ecstasy of merely human love. Even in this world, then, divine love is not always drudgery or the dark night of the soul.

Nor is earthly love in this world always ecstasy. The question might be asked, without any wish to be merely cynical, "What about the countless cases of striving for earthly love in which there is never any ecstasy at all? The repeated frustrations, the fruitless longing, the bitter weeping for lost loves? The loves once ardent, fleetingly experienced, now dead and gone forever?

No, it is not the lovers of Christ who live in a world of make-believe, but the devotee of merely earthly sinful love. It is he who must build up a world of make-believe to color or cover the actual sordid facts of life. The gift of imagination with its magic brush is his great boon; and if it were not for imagination and its magic brush, brother Cupid would be a very idle little boy.

But Jesus Christ is no creature of romantic imagination. He is infinite loveliness incarnate. If we make love to Him, we need have no fear that disappointment lies in wait for our longing hearts. He is all our hearts

desire; and our hearts were made to desire Him. All our heart, all our mind, all our soul, all our strength!

Even all our eyes. Our eyes were made to enjoy beauty. But not just beauty in the abstract; not just something beautiful, but *someone* beautiful. And that Someone is the one and only perfectly lovely human being, Jesus Christ. Artists and philosophers conduct long discussions on the nature of beauty, and always wind up with vague conclusions. "Beauty is what pleases the eye," is as close as they can come. The description is true; but it does not go far enough. "Beauty is Jesus Christ," the One our eyes were made to see and be filled with to perfect satiety; and those eyes wander about, seeking, seeking; measuring, rejecting, comparing, and seeking again, throughout life, for the One in Whom they were made to find their complete and eternal satisfaction.

•

IT HAS even been stated by one of the great philosophers and poets of history, who is also a doctor of the Church, St. Thomas Aquinas, that there is a connection between the resurrection of the body and the perfect beauty of Jesus Christ. The splendor of the human Christ in heaven, he says, is such that it would be a pity, even a kind of waste or loss, if there were never to be human eyes to enjoy it. And so on the last day almighty God will raise up dead eyes from the dust, and grant them light, "perpetual light," to fill this need and provide the beauty of the human Christ with the fascinat-

ed gazing, the infatuated, ecstatic, eternal admiration it deserves.

Such a person, such a personality, can hardly be called "vague;" it is ourselves, God forgive us, who are vague in our knowledge of His infinite vitality. Even in this world He was anything but vague, weak and watery; certainly He was nothing of the kind to His enemies. He would have lived a good deal longer in this world if He had contrived to water down the stern uncompromising stand He took about Himself, and about His enemies:

I am the Light of the world.
For this was I born, for this I came
into the world, to give testimony to
the truth.

I am come to seek not the just but
sinners.

You are of your father, the devil.
I know My Father, and if I should say
I know Him not,
I should be like you, a liar!

Before Abraham was made, I am!

Nor was He "pious and religious" in the unctuous, unpleasant sense of the term. Among the many charges His enemies brought against Him, this was never one. He was never accused by them of being too pious, too churchy, hypocritical, or anything of the kind. Rather the opposite:

He destroys the temple!
He seduces the people!
He is possessed by the devil!

To His enemies He was rather a revolutionary than a religious do-

gooder; rather Robin Hood than Uriah Heep!

And as regards the objection of His being too much the preacher of obvious moral platitudes, while there are many persons who think of Jesus Christ in this way, the fact is that He never spoke a "platitude" in His life. Original, unexpected, paradoxical, are rather the terms to describe His character and His preaching.

I am not come to bring peace, but a sword!

If any man look at a woman to lust after her,
he hath already committed adultery with her in his heart.

The Queen of Sheba came from the ends of the earth
to hear the wisdom of Solomon;
and there is a greater than Solomon here!

I and My Father are one!

There was about Him also a rugged down-to-earth quality, a kind of contempt for the obvious and the platitudinous. It can be found exemplified most strikingly of all in the manner of the death He chose for

Himself. If He were nothing but a pious popular preacher (which He was not), and if He had it in His power to choose the kind of death He would die (which He did), certainly He would have died surrounded by such comforts as His pious friends could provide, preferably in the wealthy home of one of them, comforted by their solicitude and their well-bred show of grief. As a matter of fact, having it in His power to choose His way of dying, He deliberately selected something rugged, bloody, even revolting: the most savage form of public execution that has ever been practiced.

The man who could make a deliberate choice of that kind for the manner of His dying, when He had it in His power to choose anything else, has absolutely nothing about Him of the weak and vague, featureless, milk-and-water Messias.

If we want character and courage in the one we love, if our hearts crave to be loved with a great love that will never count the cost, we have our heart's desire on the cross of Jesus Christ.

THE POWER OF THE MASS

The real genius of the Roman Catholic Church is her ability to make God real to the last and least of the human race. There are listless worshippers before Catholic altars, yet the divine glow is present in enough hearts with sufficient frequency to make the Roman Mass the most successful religious service known to man.

The hush which comes over most congregations when the consecrated host is elevated is not a matter of theatrical effects cleverly arranged; something is really happening in the hearts of the people. As a Protestant untrained in Catholic worship, the writer can testify that there have been repeated occasions when the Mass was for him a channel of divine grace. The power of the Mass is a fact that Protestants cannot escape; it must be faced.

The Christian Century — J. R. Scotford

? ? Readers Ask... ? ?

The Pope's Authority

Louis G. Miller, C.S.S.R.

PROBLEM: A Protestant acquaintance of mine contends that there was no central authority in the Catholic Church until the fourth century after Christ. He says it was then that the pope seized the supreme power; before that he was just another bishop. Therefore, he says, the pope does not have any authority to teach the world and make laws for the Church.

ANSWER: It is clear first of all that St. Peter himself showed authoritative leadership after the death of Christ. You need only read the Scriptural Acts of the Apostles to see this demonstrated. The question raised by our correspondent is whether Peter's successors in the first centuries showed that same authoritative leadership over the Church. Here are several instances to prove that they did.

It should be readily understood that many documents were lost in the terrific persecution against the early Christians. The first 32 popes were all martyrs. There is a clear record, however, of a letter which dates back to about the year 95 A. D., 25 years after St. Peter's martyrdom. It was written by Peter's successor, Clement, the fourth bishop of Rome. It seems the people of the city of Corinth (where St. Paul had preached) were refusing to obey their priests. St. John the apostle was still living at this time, probably at Ephesus, not far from Corinth. But it was not John (with the authority of an apostle) who wrote to correct them; it was Clement, with the authority of a pope: "You, who laid the foundation for

rebellion, submit to the priests, and accept chastisement for repentance. . . . But if some should disobey the words which have been spoken by Him (Christ) through us, let them know they will involve themselves in no small transgression and danger. . . . You will afford us no small pleasure if you obey what we have written through the Holy Spirit."

Ten years later St. Ignatius, bishop of the venerable see of Antioch, is being taken to his martyrdom. Several letters he wrote have been preserved, and one was addressed to the Roman Church: "To the Church that is beloved and enlightened . . . worthy of honor, worthy of blessing, worthy in her purity, and presiding over the brotherhood . . . "

In the year 140 A. D., St. Irenaeus, writing against some early heretics called Gnostics, appealed to the authority of Rome and its bishop, who was also the pope: "For unto this church, on account of its commanding position, every church, that is to say, the faithful from everywhere, must needs resort, and in it the tradition that comes from the apostles has been continuously preserved . . . "

Finally, we mention the following impressive recognition of papal authority. It is a quotation from a letter written by St. Cyprian, bishop of Carthage in Africa in the year 256 A. D.; his reference is to enemies who were seeking to defame him: "They dare set sail and carry letters from schismatics and profane persons to the

Chair of Peter, the primatial church, whence the unity of the Church has its rise."

These are only a few out of many instances which might be mentioned, but they should clearly demonstrate that the central authority in the Catholic Church which is vested in the pope is not some-

thing which came into being after several centuries. St. Peter recognized and exercised that authority given him by Christ, and he handed down an awareness of that authority to his successors. For Peter was the rock upon which Christ built His Church, and each of his successors has been a rock upon which the true Church has remained unshaken.

NURSES' AIDES

The angels in white who in some places use pastel colors for their uniforms, are busy people in any hospital. Busy and important, as you know if you have ever been sick. We cannot praise their calling too much nor invite others too often to follow their profession of mercy.

The simple fact seems to be, though, that there are not enough of them to do all the work that the sick require. Hospital care of the sick is no longer the last resort to which relatives of days gone by would consent only when no other solution seemed at hand.

We are getting used to visiting relatives and friends in hospitals where operations or serious illnesses are easily handled. We have lost our fear of hospitals and appreciate their worth much more. Frankly, too, with medical insurance we are better able to afford such expert attention.

You can multiply hospitals with enough dollars. Nurses cannot be bought. A long training and often a short career until marriage add to the problem.

Nurses' aides, both professional and voluntary, are the modern solution to this shortage of nursing care. Trained to handle much of the ordinary patient care in institutions and in private homes, these aides greatly increase the pool of medical personnel. Every such addition to the medical corps assists the practice of charity to the sick.

To these nurses' aides goes our appreciation. To all who may be looking for an apostolic way to spend some leisure hours we encourage a similar devotion to the sick through some kind of assistance to the nursing field.

The Advocate

NO EXCEPTIONS

We cannot even imagine Christ mounting the gibbet of the cross with a selected group in mind, one hemisphere and not another, this nationality and not that one, this period of time and no other.

We adore Christ, and we praise Him because by His cross He redeemed nothing less than the WHOLE WORLD. He died for the world. He rose from the tomb to share His life with the world.

Medical Missionary

SIDEGLANCES

By the Bystander

Must We Aid Foreign Nations?

UP TO now, most Americans have been led to think about aid to foreign nations as a purely political or military measure, that can be argued for or against with almost equal intensity. Those for such aid have argued that, in today's divided world, we need friends among other nations, no matter how underprivileged these people may be. We need them to fight for us and with us in the event of a war, instead of against us.

If they are to be our friends, the argument has run, we need to give them 1) military weapons, and 2) economic aid so that the people can be built up to a point where they will be strong enough to use the weapons.

Those who are against aid to foreign nations speak of it in terms of "a give-away," sometimes a "boomerang" that eventually will be used by ingrates to hurt us, or as an injustice to our own citizens who are being impoverished or at least economically hurt by the heavy taxation required to support foreign aid programs. In short, a huge preponderance of the discussion about foreign aid, both in official Washington, and in newspapers and among ordinary citizens, has centered around

the simple question: "Is it good for us or bad for us?"

In the past year or two, however, a beginning has been made in raising the entire controversy about aid to foreign nations above the purely pragmatic, or political, or practical or self-interested basis on which it has remained so long. Two priests have been especially prominent in effecting this beginning of a change of outlook, though many others, priests and lay persons, Catholics and non-Catholics, have contributed their share of influence to discussions of the problem. The question about which these two priests, and the many others interested in the same line of thought, propose as the new starting point for all discussions of aid to foreign nations is this: "Is there such a thing as international social justice?" In laymen's language, that question may be broken down into these words: "Do privileged nations owe something to underprivileged nations according to a natural, moral and divine law? Is it possible to work out any principles according to which such indebtedness can be measured, defined, applied to the present situation in the world?" It is important for those who have followed us thus

far to put aside previous political leanings and convictions on the subject of foreign aid, if they would grasp the tremendous moral question that is now being raised. We shall present it through the two priests mentioned above.

THE first is Father William A. Kaschmitter, a Maryknoll priest who up to 1956 was a missionary in Japan, and, before he came to Japan, had been a missionary in China. Happenings in both countries led to his interest in international social justice, which today has become an all-consuming apostolate in his life. In China, he learned that as many as a million people were starving to death in a single year, and that at a time when American farmers were being paid for not cultivating their fields. In Japan, he was present during the intense drive of some of the leaders of the U.S. occupation forces to spread the practice of birth-control. When he raised his voice against this campaign, he was at once challenged to bring forth some positive solution for the overwhelming population problem. He then realized that it was high time for Catholic scholars to do some serious thinking about the solution to such problems.

He began to arm himself with facts, and to travel about seeking to interest serious thinkers in solutions to the problem presented by the facts. Here are some facts: 1) the U. S. Department of Agricul-

ture estimates that there are about 16,000,000,000 acres of land on earth that could produce food; yet only about 3,400,000,000 (less than one-fourth) are being used. 2) More than half the people in the world do not have what is needed for a decent human existence; they don't have enough food, clothing, decent shelter, etc. Many starve to death; many millions go to bed hungry every night of their lives. 3) Very little thinking has been done about remedying this situation, even on the part of Christian scholars; rather it seems to have been taken for granted that there is nothing to be done, except insofar as pure self-interest dictates.

Father Kaschmitter then sets down two basic principles that must be the starting point of a science of international social justice. They are, 1) God has given every human being a real right to a human existence, simply because he is a human being; 2) The correlative of a right is not charity but justice. To give our neighbor in charity what is due to him in justice is sordid mockery. He contends too that action based on a science of international social justice will not turn out to be harmful to those nations that take part in it. Raising the sub-human standards of living of 1,500,000,000 people would solve once and for all every problem of overproduction, and increase everybody's prosperity.

The one task to which Father Kaschmitter has now dedicated

himself is that of organizing world-wide intellectual and financial cooperation to support a program, first, of research, and second, of action. The University of Louvain in Belgium has agreed to act as the headquarters of this effort, with a committee of noted scholars to explore the scientific angles and to make tentative plans to publish a magazine that will make their findings known.

The second priest who is prominent in the new approach to the world-wide problem of the "haves" and the "have-nots" is Father Leon H. Janssen, a Jesuit who is a specialist in the economics of underdeveloped countries at the Catholic Social Center, Schiedam, the Netherlands. In an article that recently appeared in *Social Order* magazine, published in St. Louis, he brings a scholarly mind to the study of the same problems that concern Father Kaschmitter.

FIRST of all, he shows what a clear parallel there is between our backward thinking about international social justice today, and the thinking of most people in the early days of the industrial revolution (about 100 years ago), about social justice for working people. In those days, when factory, mine and mill workers were laboring long and inhuman hours, for miserable pittances that kept them near starvation, it was common to hear or read the situation described as pitiable, and yet with an underlying as-

sumption that nothing could be done about it; it was just meant to be that way by God. That employees must be overworked and underpaid was a fact of life to many people, something like an earthquake or a tornado. But something was done about it. The popes spoke out against unjust wage contracts; thinkers in colleges and universities wrote books, gave lectures, gradually evolved a science of social justice; unions were formed; governments used their influence, until today a large proportion of industrial workers are receiving a wage, and are working under humane rules, that make possible decent human living for themselves and their families.

There is much of the same unenlightened thinking that marked the first years of the industrial revolution in England and America, in the thinking of most of us today about starving people in far-off lands. We say, in effect, "It's too bad that people in India or Africa have to try to live on 20¢ a day. It's too bad that millions are starving in China. It is also too bad that nothing can be done about it." Some people are not even sympathetic about the situation, just as some were in no way sympathetic about self-starving industrial workers in England and America 100 years ago. We are old enough to recall still current expressions of this lack of sympathy (or regard for elementary justice) in our youth: "Why pay laborers more than 30¢ an

hour? They don't know any better, and if you pay them more, they'll just go to taverns and drink it up in beer." So today, you often hear travelers from countries with vast millions of underprivileged and half-starving people say: "The natives have nothing, but they seem to be very happy and contented. It would be a shame to spoil them by raising their standards of living."

Father Janssen is not blind to the fact that Christian missionaries have done whatever they could to better the living conditions of underprivileged peoples to whom they have come primarily to preach the Gospel. But their resources are usually so meagre and the needs so vast that they could accomplish very little. Indeed, it sometimes happens that the missionary is reduced to living like the poor people he comes to serve, instead of being able to elevate them even a notch in their own way of living. The task, as he sees it, is therefore one for prosperous nations to assume. But before they will assume it, millions who make up these nations must be made aware of an obligation under the heading of international social justice. He sets down three principles, drawn from traditional Christian theology, as starting points.

1) *Man is seriously bound by the law of charity, and sometimes by justice, to help a fellow human being who is in extreme need of soul or body.* The one fact (out

of many) that millions of people are starving to death certainly establishes the circumstance of extreme need. The fact that they may be 5000 miles away does not remove the obligation. And if only whole nations, living in prosperity, are able to cope with the need, instead of mere individuals or groups of individuals, then the obligation falls upon such nations.

2) *The closer the relationship between nations, the greater is the obligation of one that is prosperous to help the people of one in need.* Relationships are established in various ways: by geographical nearness, by colonialism, by race and national origin, by traditional friendships, etc. Much study must be given to the question of preferences when these are to be made.

3) *The principle of "reasonable hope of fruit" must always be kept in mind.* If it is obvious that aid given to a nation will be gobbled up by rich land-owners or corrupt political leaders, who will leave the common people in misery, it would not be virtue but folly to give such aid until economic and political reforms have been effected in such nations. In nations under dictatorships such as the Communists, the presumption is against any hope of really helping the common people by aid given to the Communist leaders.

Each of these principles requires tremendous study, research, analy-

sis, examination. But to every Christian in the world, the very subject of international social justice should be an inspiring and exciting one. Just as the whole vast earth has been drawn into a closer unity by advances in trans-

portation and communications, so we should dream of the day when all its nations will be drawn together in a bond of justice and charity that will be the most solid foundation of peace that has ever been known.

Thoughts for the Shut-In

Listening and Looking

THE bedside radio has long been part of the permanent furniture in most hospitals, and, we dare say, in most homes where an invalid is to be found. And now in recent years bedside television sets have become more and more common. These wonderful tools of communication with the outside world have brought much joy and comfort to the sick.

Much of what comes over the air waves is not of any great spiritual nor even cultural value. We have known some shut-ins who grew so fed up with the constant radio diet of rock-and-roll that they banished the radio from their presence. But one must take the sour with the sweet; there are good things on radio and television to counterbalance the bad. Our suggestion is that shut-ins train themselves in the discipline of selectivity, preferring silence to shoddy emanations of sound.

There are, however, a number of good spiritual programs which should not be bypassed if they are available in a particular area.

The Sacred Heart program, produced by Jesuit priests in St. Louis, Mo., is outstanding. More than 1000 radio stations carry it three times weekly in its radio version, and it is telecast as well on 100 commercial stations in the United States

and Canada. Father Peyton's Family Theatre produces excellent plays and occasional religious pageants which are very widely shown and heard. Then there is the Ave Maria Hour, sponsored by the Graymoor Fathers; and the Hour of St. Francis, by the Franciscans. Almost every Catholic knows of the Catholic Hour, produced for many years by the National Council of Catholic Men, and the Christopher programs produced by Father Keller.

These are only a few examples. There are others of national scope, and many more that are restricted to a particular city or locality. A study of the local newspaper, or, if necessary, a letter to the local radio and television stations should bring information as to what religious and inspirational programs are available and when.

Let the shut-in listen to and watch them, and we suggest that, if possible, he do even more. Let him write to the sponsors of these programs and express his appreciation or his criticism. Mail, whether for or against, is like manna from heaven to those who are working in the communications field. All too often they are made to feel that they are working in a vacuum of public indifference.

Leonard F. Hyland, C.S.S.R.



readers retort

In which readers are invited to express their minds on articles and opinions published in *The Liguorian*. Letters must be signed and full address of the writer must be given, though city and name will be withheld from publication on request.

There Goes the Bride

In the June issue of your magazine the article, "Here Comes the Bride!" was the most absurd thing I ever read. From the day little girls are born their mothers, and also the little girl as she grows older, dream of the daughter's wedding day. When I read this sarcastic article I immediately thought it could only be written by a person who had been jilted and disappointed in love. I had always heard that many people enter the convent or seminary after they have been disappointed in love. Why do priests and nuns always try to put a damper on the beautiful things of life? You mentioned in your cynical way that "the cheapest part in the whole wedding is the stipend for the clergyman." I believe \$20 or \$25 is a very good salary for one hour of work. My husband works 10 hours for that amount. Your article dripped with animosity. It was only after I reopened the May issue and re-read "The Body in the Basement" that I found the answer on the first page: the same person wrote both articles and really hates all women and weddings since he found out the girl he loved was married. Maybe it would have been better for him if he had looked for another beautiful girl to share his life instead of becoming a crabby soured-on-life priest. We have too many of them now. If you priests had a happy home life instead of a frustrated lonely life, the Catholic religion on a whole would be better off — in more ways than

one. You won't print this, but I've got it off my chest, and you know it's the truth. St. Charles, Mo. A. M.

• *We are willing to testify under oath, if it would be necessary, that the article on weddings and "The Body in the Basement" were NOT written by the same priest. The story of the body in the basement, as we stated in a previous issue, was fiction, and the author of the story was never disappointed in love, and he is just as happy in his priestly life as a human being can be in the state of life he has chosen. The same can be said of the author of the article on weddings, who has spent many years working as a parish missionary and parish priest and has officiated at many weddings.*

The editors

Beautiful Ceremony

A friend of mine has handed me your magazine for several months. You priests have some of the goofiest ideas! And do you like to gripe! About everything! My daughter was married in a Catholic church — a beautiful ceremony — even an extra bouquet for the Virgin's altar. I just read "Here Comes the Bride!" in the June issue. My daughter had a beautiful wedding dress that wasn't revealing. We paid the bills, so why are you griping? It would seem you priests are always eager to start trouble with your insinuations and picking other people to pieces, especially people

of other faiths. Where is your charity? It is easily understood why one out of every four abandon the Catholic Church.

Missouri

Mrs. E. S.

• We have only words of praise for this mother who arranged for such a thoroughly Catholic wedding for her daughter. If all Catholic parents would follow her example in this matter, there would be no need of articles like "Here Comes the Bride!"

The editors

No Privileged Class

After having finished reading the letters to the editors in the June issue, and indeed the entire issue from cover to cover, I am appalled by many of the opinions expressed by other correspondents. There seems to exist a general feeling that the laws of God and His Church should be flexible to suit every particular habit of sin rather than to be inflexible and to condemn all sin. The feeling seems to persist that what is convenient and pleasurable is right and acceptable, and what is difficult or painful is unacceptable and should be avoided at all costs. I am amused by the idea that a vow of chastity somehow completely dissolves all human passion and that the sexually normal — the married people — are expected and permitted to indulge freely and without consequence in acts of biological love. Poor St. Joseph! He must have been terribly abnormal and under-sexed. All my adult life I have fought against sins of impurity and have prayed unceasingly for strength. What a waste! All I should have had to do is take a vow of chastity and all human passion would have disappeared. Do these people who seem so completely preoccupied by sex actually believe that this expression of love is more important than the promise of paradise? Do they actually believe that the time is not coming very soon when they will have the opportunity of dying for their faith or else making compromise

after compromise until they have nothing left in which to believe? I must pity those who would so prostitute the love of God and their faith that their only solace and strength lie in their sexual prowess. They will become worse than beasts. If we do not find our faith to be worth living for, how much less will we find it to be worth dying for! I would offer only one criticism of your magazine and of the preaching from the pulpits of our churches: you and other priests do not hit hard enough and often enough. Perhaps the fear remains that you will drive some from the Church. But this fear is groundless. If we Catholics cannot accept truth and the way of life commanded by our Lord, we are already lost to the Church. It used to be customary to pray for the grace of a happy death. Perhaps now we should pray for the grace of courage needed for martyrdom. A great many of us will need it before the end of this century. In conclusion, I should like to remind the "comfortable Catholics" of the words of Leon Bloy: "There is but one sadness: not to have been a saint." Los Angeles, Calif.

J. A. A.

God Will Understand

Recently a friend of mine brought to my attention the article in your publication, "Does It Cost Too Much To Be Pure?" I must say that I am in wholehearted agreement with the girls who say that it does cost too much. About a year ago I broke up my engagement to a Catholic boy because we found it hard to stay in the state of grace whenever he came to see me on week ends. We broke up on the advice of a well-meaning Catholic priest. Now I am wondering whether I did the right thing in acting on such advice. Let me add that I loved and still love this boy, and I am sure he still loves me too. He is hard-working, ambitious, does not drink or smoke and very seldom uses harsh language. His only fault, it seems to me, is that he loved me too much and that he

found it difficult to suppress his emotions and feelings toward me. For a good while I thought along your lines that no marriage was better than one built on sin, and now I am wondering whether this line of thinking is correct or not. You see, shortly after our break-up I began to do some reading and to confide in some of my married friends. I have found out that my decision was not right and that all I did was just run away from difficulties which confront all engaged couples. Now I am seriously considering giving up my pride to ask my friend if we could take up where we left off. I know this will mean falling into mortal sin occasionally but I am sure God will understand and accept our best effort no matter how poor it is.

N. N.

• All young people who keep steady company as a preparation for marriage are in some danger of committing sin and the danger cannot be considered insignificant. But it is a mistake to say, "I know that we are going to commit sin." Nobody has to say that. Company-keeping is an occasion of sin, but it is necessary as a preparation for marriage, and, therefore, it is permitted and justified. But the two who are keeping company must use all the help God offers to overcome temptation and to control their strong human inclinations. If a couple have used all these helps and have tried by proper conduct while on dates to remain free from sin and have failed again and again and again, then, if marriage is not possible within a short time, they must break up. However, the fact that a couple has occasionally done wrong in company-keeping does not mean that a break-up is necessary, provided that they are willing and able to marry within a reasonable time and that they are receiving the sacraments frequently and praying and trying to be prudent about the manner of their company-keeping. God offers all of us the help we need to overcome temptation, but we must go to Him

and ask for the help we need to overcome temptation; we must make use of the means of grace He has provided; we must avoid the things that lead up to temptation — even in company-keeping. No one is justified in saying, "I know this will mean falling into mortal sin occasionally." That is a surrender before the challenge is offered. And to add that God will understand and accept "our best effort" is not fooling anybody — surely not God. Yes, God will understand — there is no doubt about that. He will understand all our weakness; He knows about our temptations; but He also knows when we consent to do wrong, and He knows that sin is SIN. If young people who say this mean that they are really going to try, that they are going to use all the means and ways of getting help from God, God will understand that, too, and He WILL help.

The editors

Love and Flowers

In your May issue in the article, "Music and Flowers," you wrote about the use of material things in the worship of the Catholic Church. It is my opinion that the use of material splendor as a measurement of our love for God is a poor choice. Surely Christ would not compare gold, splendor and riches with all the human offerings and sacrifices made by us day after day. If He did want us to use this form of honor, I feel sure that many who have riches would be paupers and many more would be without great wealth. Why do Catholics feel the need to honor Christ materialistically? I have found my closest moments to Christ in a tiny chapel, rather than in all the splendor of St. Patrick's Cathedral.

Jamaica, N. Y.

F. A. M.

• The article in the May issue did not say that the use of splendid external things in the worship of the Church is a measurement of our love of God. External, material things are used as an EXPRESSION

of our desire to do for God as much as we can — which goes over into the idea of all sacrifice. If a person can feel close to God in a tiny chapel, that is no argument against having splendid churches. If a mother finds that the moments when she is closest to her child are the moments when the child is hungry, living in a poor home, in need of clothing, that is no reason to say that she would not give the child the best of clothing and food and shelter if she could. A mother does not say to her child, "Don't expect me to show my love for you by giving you a lot of meaningless toys and presents and nice things. You know I love you, and you don't need toys and things to be given to you to know about my love. So, go barefoot for a while, because you know I am close to you and I love you, even if I don't buy you a pair of shoes and simply keep my money in the bank."

The editors

Wise Mother-in-law

I am a mother-in-law. I liked the "Points of Friction" column in the June issue on in-law trouble. Our youngest is 20 years old. Perhaps I am different from other mothers, but I am not sorry that my family is raised. The years of bringing them up were hard years and while I cherish in my golden album of memories every moment I have had with my children from the time of birth, I do not wish to have those days back. My husband is now busily painting the house, inside and out. We are going to sell our home and store our furniture and take that long vacation that we have dreamed about for so long. Then we are going to find a spot where we can have a small business — just enough to make a living for the two of us, and we are going to do the things we like to do; for my husband, some fishing and hunting (he says he is going to teach me to fish, too), and for me, Legion of Mary work, I hope. There is so much

in the way of apostolic and charitable work to be done in the world today, that I cannot understand why a mother-in-law would want to spend her time making a daughter-in-law miserable with her meddling. She should be happy that for her the time of mandatory housekeeping is over, and turn her maturity and experience toward vital work that needs to be done for God, and for which she is now admirably qualified.

Burbank, Calif.

N. N.

• *We think this mother-in-law displays admirable common sense in the attitude she takes toward her married children and toward the possibilities for good she still has in her life. Such an adjustment may not be easy for all mothers, but it can be made and it will be repaid with much peace of mind. Do not our mother-in-law readers agree?*

The editors

Bright Side and Dark Side

In the article, "Teen-agers and Farming," the writer presented the bright side of farm life, but I doubt if he knows what farm life really is like. He may have been born on one of these modern farms, but I doubt if he has ever had much experience in actual farming of any kind. I may be wrong, but I think his farm knowledge has come mostly from books and some of the big modern farms he perhaps has visited. I am writing from 35 years of experience of farm life. I was born on a 40-acre farm and it was a hard, rugged life for father and mother to make expenses in those days, and it's just as hard today. The good farm land is owned by banks and insurance companies. The little farmer — 40 to 60 acres — is being squeezed out as the years go by. Why is he leaving? Because government restrictions are put on him until he can't have enough land to farm; so he has to go to the town or city to look for part-time work. This in turn puts the laborer in the city out of work. Factories

will hire a farmer before they will hire a city-dweller, because they know the farmer will work harder and at non-union wages. It's reasonable that he can work at a cheaper wage, because the farmer does not have all the taxes and other expenses that the man in the city has. He can also supply his family table with things grown on the farm. A farmer is not his own boss today. He never could regulate his hours to a time-clock if he wanted to. He has a certain time to plant his crops and sometimes, because of bad weather, he has to put in long, hard hours. He has the weeds, pests and storms and floods to put up with while the crop is growing. The writer said nothing about this darker side of the farmer's life, but I have lived through all of it. Yes, a farmer must be a man of many skills and he must never expect to become a millionaire either. I'll say that 90% of our farm boys and girls who live on a farm today will never be farmers. Why won't they? Our schools prepare our young people for white-collar jobs and not the art of farming. This is my opinion about farming compared to the article in your magazine and I have expressed it so that others can get a better understanding of what farm life really is.

St. Joseph, Mo.

L. F. R.

The Crowded Church

In your latest issue you gave reasons why people come late for Mass. You missed one group, and I'll tell you about them now. They are the people who make it a regular habit to be late for Mass in our parish so that they can have the choice seats, where the air is better, and where one is not shoved from side to side. I was taught as a child to be at least five minutes early for Mass, but in our parish church this is a mistake. The ushers walk up and down the aisles looking for a place to jam in a few more people, and the poor souls who come early can neither see the altar nor find room to kneel or sit properly. I

know we should be sweet about it, but when the same people actually *admit* that they arrive late to get a better seat, something should be done about it. I still abhor the idea of deliberately arriving late, but the whole idea is becoming more appealing all the time. At any rate, this is one of the big reasons why some people come late for Mass in our parish.

Portland, Ore.

N. N.

Another Reason

In reference to the article on why people come late for Sunday Mass I would like to remark that there are many reasons, besides the few you mentioned, and some of these reasons are GOOD reasons for coming late. For instance, my sister goes to the 11:00 a.m. Mass and I go to the 12 o'clock Mass. I must wait until she comes home as we have had our mother as an invalid for seven years in our home, and one of us must always be with her. So remember that one cannot draw quick conclusions about why some people come late for Mass. We never know what another person must sacrifice to get to Mass at all, to say nothing of getting there on time. And only God knows which person attends Mass with more devotion — the one who comes late for a good reason or the one who stands at the back of the church and dives out as soon as Holy Communion is distributed, or the one who hogs the seat at the end of the pew so that everybody has to step over. I think the one that runs or walks out in a hurry before Mass is over is the greatest offender — but who knows? Maybe he has a good reason, too, for leaving so abruptly.

Chicago, Ill.

K. K.

Kind Words

I enjoy THE LIGUORIAN very much. You could almost sub-title the magazine "Bull's-eye" because you hit the heart of the target so often.

Helena, Mont.

E. S. Y.

MISTAKES

ABOUT

Check yourself and see whether any of the following errors have entered your thinking or practice concerning prayer.

THERE are few doctrines or practices of religion universally known that are yet subject to more erroneous views than that of prayer. Everybody knows what prayer is; almost everybody who possesses any religion makes use of it in one form or another, at one time or another; yet a large percentage of those who do use it are not without some of the mistaken notions about prayer.

There are ten popular erroneous concepts about prayer. They will be stated here as they are often stated and argued for by misguided persons. A word or two concerning the truth will be added to the presentation of each mistake.

1. Prayer is useless because God already knows everything a human being needs.

There is no connection between the fact that God already knows what

PRAYER

JAMES BARRY, C.S.S.R.

human beings need and the necessity of prayer. The reason for this is that it was God Himself Who told human beings that He wanted them to pray and that by reason of their prayers they will be granted things they need. The person who has enough faith in God to believe that He knows everything, even future events, should have an equal faith in the importance of what God has said and commanded human beings to do. He said: "Ask and you shall receive." It all comes back to this, that God made men free, and despite the fact that He knows what they will do with their freedom, He still leaves it up to that freedom to decide and determine many things. Prayer is one of the uses to which man can put his freedom, and on it, according to the will of God, many things depend.

2. The only kind of prayer is that of petition, that is, asking for things.

Some people never raise their mind and heart and voice to God except when they want or need something. It is true that some authors limit their definition of prayer to words of petition, but it can be correctly said that there are many forms of prayer whose purpose is not primarily petition. In fact it is doubtful whether a prayer of petition will be of much value unless it be preceded by or accompanied with prayers of adoration (recognizing God's power and authority), of resignation (accepting God's will as always best), of reparation (expressing sorrow and atonement for one's sins), of gratitude (thanking God for the many good things already received from Him). Many people pray much during war, but only for the safety of their loved ones. But never do they pray in thanksgiving, reparation, adoration and love.

3. The only kind of prayer of petition is for material things.

This error represents a total misconception of the purpose of life. No one can pray properly who does not accept the truth that the most important things in life are the attainment of heaven and the help and strength necessary to live the kind of life that will earn heaven. No material thing would be worth while if it were to interfere with or even lessen one's chances of attaining heaven. Therefore persons who believe in God and in prayer should make a general, universal intention by which they set as the first object of every

prayer of petition they ever say the necessary graces and helps to win heaven. Only when they have thus safeguarded the most important thing in life should they turn their attention to the less important, such as relief from illness, material support, success in business and love, etc.

4. Prayer has great value, but only in a psychological way. It makes one feel better and relieves anxiety and fear.

This is the theme of wishy-washy articles forever appearing in secular magazines. Even agnostics, who profess no definite belief in God, often pay tribute to prayer as a psychological lift. Nothing could be sillier for intelligent people. Either prayer is what it appears to be, an appeal to God which one knows will be heard or answered in some way, or it is nothing but a mockery. If there are weak-minded people (no matter how learned) who find some comfort and support in deliberately deluding themselves that they are speaking to a definite person and asking for something from Him, while all the while they do not believe there is any such Person or that He can help them, they are to be greatly pitied.

5. Prayer can supply for common sense, prudence and industry in carrying out one's tasks and fulfilling one's duties.

The fallacy that one may live in sloth and neglect of duty and at the same time make up for the evil results of such a life by spending much time in prayer is a not uncommon one. It could even be sinful to spend

time in prayer if the time thus spent belonged by obligation to the duties of one's state in life. God wants no one to neglect prayer and frequent prayer, but He surely wants no one to try to make prayer substitute for necessary work. Sometimes, too, it is as necessary to study and consult in order to learn the proper way to fulfill one's tasks as it is to pray for enlightenment and success. Prayer won't make up for a man's neglect to use his head in solving the problems that confront him.

6. Prayer can save a person from the effect of his own sinful folly.

This fallacy appears in the conduct of anyone who deliberately places himself in a serious occasion of sin, and then thinks that by praying he can escape the consequences. There is something of the same wrong attitude in persons who continually and deliberately live in a habit of serious sin and yet pray daily, not for the grace to escape the habit of sin, but for the superstitious purpose of averting the harm that might come to them from their sins. We have even known crassly superstitious persons to pray for success in some sinful venture, which is a form of mocking blasphemy against God.

7. Prayer requires a certain place, time, and attitude, and a specific formula, to be a good prayer.

There are some people who fall into the error of believing that the value of prayer depends on some minor or accidental consideration: whether it is said kneeling, whether it is said at a certain time, whether a certain

formula is used, etc. Here is the truth: Kneeling is a good posture for prayer, nay, the best posture, but it is not essential to a good prayer. If a person cannot kneel because of rheumatism or arthritis, he should never harbor the thought that therefore he cannot say a good prayer. Furthermore, prayer should not be confined to the times when even a well person can kneel down; one should be able to pray while standing, sitting, walking, riding, etc.

Again, there are especially appropriate times for prayer, such as, mornings and evenings, before and after meals, etc., but prayers said at other times are just as good. Lastly, it may be said that the formal prayers, such as the *Our Father*, and the *Hail Mary*, are most excellent prayers; but that does not mean that they are the only formulas that can be used in prayer. Old people sometimes worry because they cannot remember the *Our Father* and the *Hail Mary*; they should be reminded that if they just say, "O God, I love You," that will be a perfect prayer for them.

8. Prayer, to be worth while, requires a feeling of devotion and enjoyment. If there be no feeling of enjoyment in praying, one may as well not pray at all.

This is entirely false. Feelings of devotion and enjoyment in prayer do not add to the value of prayer; indeed, they may detract from their value because they make it unnecessary for the will to exert itself to any extent. Certain it is that prayers said when the feelings are cold and unmoved and the heart empty of all

attraction for prayer are the most pleasing prayers in the sight of God because they spring entirely from the will to please God despite one's feelings. God does not permit the merit or value of anything human to depend on feelings alone. He knows that feelings rise and fall, ebb and flow, wax strong and wane, sometimes according to the health or the weather or the season. It is the will that counts in prayer as in everything else in life.

9. Prayer is always spoiled if distractions make the mind wander while it is being said. Prayers should be said over again if one finds that he has been distracted while saying them.

Distractions ruin the value of prayer and are offensive to God only when they are voluntarily indulged, that is, if one deliberately permits his mind to wander while conscious of the fact that it should be fixed on the subject matter of its prayers. Dis-

tractions that catch one unawares and remain only until one becomes conscious of them do not spoil the prayers said while they were present in the mind. Prayers of obligation that are said with unwanted distractions in the mind should not be repeated.

10. The only kind of prayer for the lay person is vocal prayer. Mental prayer or meditation is only for priests and religious.

It is sad that this is a common error among all classes of people. It is not true. Any lay person who wants to lead a very good life and to grow in love for God, not only can but should make use of mental prayer. Mental prayer simply means spending a period of time in silent communion with God; recognizing His presence, recalling His attributes, lessons, words and example, and asking mentally for further enlightenment on His will and further strength to put it into practice.

CAUTIOUS REPORTER

A cub reporter had been warned of the dangers of libel, and on his first assignment — covering a reception — he took no chances, as witness: "A woman giving the name of Mrs. J. C. Jones, who is reported to be one of the society leaders in this section, is said to have given what purported to be a reception yesterday afternoon. It is understood that a considerable number of so-called guests, reported to be ladies notorious in society circles, were present, and some of them are quoted as saying they enjoyed the occasion. It is charged that the firm Bivins and Spivins furnished the refreshments and Stringham the alleged music. The hostess is said to have worn a necklace of alleged pearls which she declares were given to her by her reputed husband."

"Kablegram"

"What was your score?" asked the first golfer.

"77," replied the beginner. "It's not too bad, I guess, but I do hope to do better on the second hole."

For Wives and Husbands Only

A Husband Who Refuses To Be a Husband



Donald F. Miller, C.S.S.R.

PROBLEM: My husband refuses to have any more than our two children, and because I refuse to have anything to do with contraception he insists on total abstinence from all marriage relations. I want very much to have more children, and when I quoted one of your articles to my husband about marriage being a contract by which the man and woman give each other the mutual right to actions necessary for begetting children, he answered that he never heard of such a thing. He says he made no such promise when we got married and does not intend to be bound by it. He maintains that he is the one who has to support the children, not I, and that he has the right to decide that our two are all we are going to have. How can I convince him of what is right?

SOLUTION: The problem of how to convince a man, who has taken a stiff-necked stand against an elementary truth of Christian morality, that he is wrong and must change his course is one task the wisest of men would give anything to be able to solve.

Three facts are objectively clear.

1) Marriage is a contract between a man and a woman in which *both* give to each other the permanent right to those actions that are both an expression of love between husband and wife and the means through which children are conceived and born. If a man (or a woman) intends at the time of marriage to contract for something different than this,

or refuses to consent to this kind of contract, he is not really entering a valid marriage at all. It is probable in the case here presented that the husband made a proper contract at the time of marriage, but is now trying to talk his way out of fulfilling its obligations.

2) It is just as gravely sinful for a husband selfishly to deprive his wife of the expression of love and affection and unity that are a secondary purpose of the marriage act, as it is for a wife to refuse her husband's reasonable requests for the same. St. Paul is very clear about this, and his words are the inspired teaching of God Himself: "Let the husband render the debt to his wife, and the wife also in like manner to her husband. The wife hath not power of her own body, but the husband. And in like manner the husband also hath not power of his own body, but the wife. Defraud not one another, except, perhaps, by consent, for a time, that you may give yourselves to prayer; and return together again, lest Satan tempt you for your incontinency." (1st Corinthians, 7:3-5)

3) A husband does not have the right to decide on his own authority that there are to be no more than two children in his family. It is true that it is his job to support his family materially, but the wife must work just as hard as he does to keep up the home and raise the children. Neither has husband or wife the sole right to decide when there shall be

abstinence from marriage relations. It is intended by God that decisions in these important matters be the product of mutual discussion and mutual agreement between husband and wife, on the basis of the circumstances in each case. In doubtful situations help should be sought from a confessor.

These are truths that cannot be denied without folly and resultant sin. What can be done to convince a husband, who denies them, that he is wrong? If he has some faith left, and has not completely

foresworn reason in favor of his prejudices against the truth, it should be possible to get through to him in the course of time. It will do no good for the wife to become bitter, to nag, to take her grievance out on him in hurting ways. She must be patient, as understanding as she can be, and filled with determination to do everything that will win her husband's respect, admiration, confidence and love. This determination carried out will usually win over any but the most neurotic of husbands to what is right and good in marriage.

TRUE SCHOLARSHIP

Modern scientific thought is not accustomed to draw back from any problem, and that is legitimate as long as it remains in its own order. But, as the moral universe transcends the physical world, every acquisition of science is located on a plane inferior to the absolute ends of the personal destiny of man and to the bonds that unite him to God. Scientific truth becomes a snare from the very instant it believes itself sufficient to explain everything without being connected with other truths and above all, with the subsisting Truth, which is a Being living and freely creative.

The work of the scholar, be it ever so disinterested and courageous, loses its highest satisfaction if he stops looking beyond purely intellectual goals to those which his conscience proposes to him, the decisive choice between good and evil, the serious direction of his life toward the conquest of spiritual values, of justice and of charity, of that charity above all which is not simple philanthropy or a mere feeling of human solidarity but proceeds from a divine source — revelation of Jesus Christ. *Pius XII — The Pope Speaks*

LIGUORIAN BINDERS

We have had hard-cover binders made to order for holding 12 copies of THE LIGUORIAN in a single volume. Anyone can insert the issues in the binder. Those who preserve their copies of THE LIGUORIAN for reference will find the binders very handy, with the index always at the end of the December issue. Order binders from THE LIGUORIAN, Liguori, Mo., at \$2.50 each.

— o —

IF YOU CHANGE YOUR ADDRESS

Please notify us promptly of your change of address, giving both your old and new address. It makes it easy for our office if you cut your stenciled address from the rear cover of one of your issues of THE LIGUORIAN and send it in when asking for a change of address. Notify us by the tenth of the month if your copy for that month has not been delivered.

This is the second of two articles discussing the question: "What happened to the First Amendment?"

What Is the Meaning of **"Separation of Church and State?"**

JAMES J. HIGGINS, C.S.S.R.

THE First Amendment to the Constitution reads, in part, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." In the minds and times of those who penned this article and adopted it into the Constitution, the phrase, *establishment of religion*, had a definite, concrete meaning. The men of that era were well acquainted with the phrase and the reality. The Constitution of South Carolina, for instance, adopted in 1778, ran: "The Christian Protestant religion shall be deemed and is hereby constituted and declared to be, the established religion of this state." Only four of the thirteen original states had no established religion.

By an *establishment of religion*, as the distinguished constitutional lawyer, Thomas J. Cooley, wrote, is meant "the setting up or recognition of a state church, or at least the conferring upon one church special favors and advantages denied to oth-

ers." (italics added) This is what the men who wrote that amendment meant to enjoin Congress from doing. This is the sense in which they understood and interpreted the phrase, *establishment of religion*. "No particular religious sect or society ought to be favored or established by law in preference to others," is what Virginia petitioned to be added in its proposed Bill of Rights.

James Madison, one of the chief framers of the Constitution, did not think a ban on an establishment of religion necessary in the national Constitution, for, as he said when addressing the Virginia Convention that was debating the ratification of the Constitution, "when there is such a variety of sects, there cannot be a majority of any one sect to oppress and persecute the rest." What he understood the proposed ban on an establishment of religion to mean and what his hearers must have under-

stood by that phrase is clear from his further words: "Fortunately for this commonwealth a majority of the people are against any exclusive establishment."

The excellent study of this provision of the First Amendment, by Joseph H. Brady, entitled *Confusion Twice Confounded* (Seton Hall University Press), makes it abundantly clear that in the usage and intention of the framers and adopters of this amendment, the phrase, *establishment of religion*, had a definite meaning, such as Cooley defined above. The practice of Congress and the Presidents of this republic, all sworn to uphold the Constitution, the interpretation of the phrase by the Supreme Court for the first century and a half, confirm the view that this is the meaning of the first provision of the First Amendment: Congress shall not give to any one religious group special favors or consideration denied to others.

Comes now the Supreme Court, a century and a half after the adoption of the amendment, (New Jersey Bus Law case, 1947) to force upon this wording of the Constitution another meaning, a meaning, we contend, entirely alien to the intention of the framers and adopters of the Constitution. Justice Black tells us:

Neither a state nor the Federal Government can set up a church. Neither can pass laws which aid one religion, *aid all religions*, or prefer one religion over another. . . No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever

they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion. . . In the words of Jefferson, the clause against establishment of religion by law was intended to erect a "wall of separation between church and state." (italics added)

Toward the close of the first part of his opinion Justice Rutledge repeats this (entirely erroneous) view:

"Religion" and "establishment" were not used in any formal or technical sense. The prohibition broadly forbids state support, financial or other, of religion in any guise, form or degree. It outlaws all use of public funds for religious purposes.

Is this still the view of the Court as to the meaning of the first provision of the First Amendment? It is difficult to say. In a later case (*Zorach v. Clauson*, 1951) a case involving the released time program of New York City, the majority upheld the city's program which permits the public schools to release students during the school day so that they may go to religious instruction centers. The majority opinion stated:

We are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being. . . When the state encourages religious instruction or cooperates with religious authorities by adjusting the schedule of public events to sectarian needs, it follows the best of our traditions. For it then respects the religious nature of our people and accommodates the public service to their spiritual needs. To hold that it would not, would be to find in the Constitution a requirement that government show a *callous indifference* to religious groups. *That would be preferring those*

who believe in no religion over those who do believe. (italics added)

The majority opinion concluded with this sentence: "We cannot read into the Bill of Rights such a philosophy of hostility to religion." The Court did not, unfortunately, disavow the McCollum decision, and in fact, only compounded the confusion by refusing to face up to the fact that the plain words of the constitutional provision in question simply restrain Congress from any action respecting an establishment of religion. Even the Justices who felt constrained to protest against reading into the Bill of Rights an hostility to religion, themselves labor under the fatal defect, that while they profess to discuss the First Amendment, they ignore it. Take this, for instance, from Justice Douglas in the New York released time case:

The First Amendment, however, does not say that in every and all respects there shall be separation of church and state. Rather, it studiously defines the manner, the specific ways, in which there shall be no concert or union or dependency one on the other.

Now, with all due respect to the Court and the legitimate authority it embodies, I cannot find anything of the sort in my copy of the Constitution and the First Amendment. (It would be a very good thing if there were such an amendment as the Justice describes above; it would make it unnecessary, in some education cases, for the Justices to rely so heavily on their own prepossessions.) No, all that I see in the First Amend-

ment, in the clause under consideration, is this: Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion. There is no mention of separation of church and state, although I would admit that the clause in question reflects a philosophy that favors a separation of church and state, if by separation of church and state is meant no establishment of any one religion.

Separation of church and state is an elastic phrase, a spacious concept, to borrow a phrase from another Justice, a wording that would be a fair prize for the eager Justices to board and do with it as they would, had we been so unfortunate to inherit such a wording in our fundamental law. But the wording is, *Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion*, and this is a wording that had and has a much more definite and easily understood meaning. And to quote Justice Frankfurter in a more enlightened moment:

After all, an amendment to the Constitution should be read in "a sense most obvious to the common understanding at the time of its adoption" . . . For it was for public adoption that it was proposed. See Mr. J. Holmes in *Eisner v. Macomber*. . . Any evidence of design or purpose not contemporaneously known could hardly have influenced those who ratified the Constitution. Remarks of a particular proponent of the Amendment, no matter how influential, are not to be deemed part of the Amendment. What was submitted for ratification was his proposal, not his speech.

This last quotation is of interest as we move on to ask on what

grounds the Court justifies its broad interpretation of a constitutional provision which had and has a literal, definite meaning? Why does the Court ignore this "sense (of the word establishment) most obvious to the common understanding at the time of its adoption?" What reasoning led the Court to strike down an Illinois statute which allowed parents to have religious instructions for their children in the public schools? What reasoning led the Court even to consider that the ban on an establishment of religion was violated when a New Jersey township provided bus transportation to accredited, though not tax-supported, schools? Or what led the Court to review, as a possible violation of the establishment clause, the action of New York City in allowing its public school pupils, at the request of parents, to be dismissed for religious instruction?

It is the contention of Brady (*Confusion Twice Confounded*) that there are no precedents for a broad interpretation of this article, that the practice of the Presidents and Congress confirm the claim that this article was meant to be taken in its literal, commonly understood sense. The Court says, it seems, "We have an insight into the meaning of this provision from a highly placed contemporary, a spiritual father, if not an actual framer of the provision." This is, in effect, what Black does say when he quotes Jefferson as writing that the clause respecting an establishment of religion was meant to erect "a wall of separation between church and state." And this is the

reason, I suppose, why the Justices so readily abandon the wording of the Amendment and point with such finality to the metaphor, *wall of separation between church and state*. They do this so often that they lead the unwary into believing this to be the wording of the Constitution, and to lead the irreverent into thinking that the Justices themselves believe this to be the wording of the Constitution.

But since the appeal is to Jefferson, to Jefferson we shall go.

This phrase of Jefferson's occurs in a letter he wrote in 1802 to the Danbury (Connecticut) Baptist Association. And he used it, it is admitted, as a paraphrase of the constitutional provision enjoining Congress from any law respecting an establishment of religion.

Connecticut had, at that time, as did other states, an established religion, the Congregational Church. As a result of this establishment of a religion by law, Baptists and others were subjected to some humiliating restrictions and reduced to a second class citizenship status. What Jefferson was hitting at, then, was an establishment of religion, in the technical sense in which it was known and objected to by the people to whom he was writing, a state of affairs in which one religious group was preferred and given status denied to others. By no means can Jefferson be enlisted as one who would agree with Black or Rutledge as to what the First Amendment means. (Black says that the First Amendment for-

bids all government aid either to one religion, or to all religions. Rutledge is of the opinion that the First Amendment "forbids state support, financial or other, of religion, in any guise, form, or degree. It outlaws all use of public funds for religious purposes.") For if Jefferson viewed the First Amendment and its no-establishment clause as prohibiting all aid to religion (Black), and a comprehensive forbidding of every form of public aid or support for religion (Rutledge), if Jefferson's metaphor, *wall of separation between church and state* meant what Black and Rutledge take it to mean, how could Jefferson (or Madison, the very architect of the Amendment) approve bills for appointment and pay of chaplains to the Congress and the armed services? How could Jefferson, sworn to uphold the Constitution, ask Congress for the maintenance of a Catholic priest and a church amongst the Kaskaskia Indians?

We remark in passing the great fascination this metaphor of Jefferson's has for the Court, a fascination so great it led a one-time professor of law at a great university to write in this fashion: "We cannot illuminatingly apply the wall of separation metaphor until we have considered the relevant history of religious education in America." But are the Justices no longer hired and sworn to apply the relevant wording of the Constitution, but rather, metaphors, even metaphors of important men? The same Justice reminded the Court in another case that "remarks of a

particular proponent of the Amendment, no matter how influential, are not to be deemed part of the Amendment. What was submitted for ratification was his proposal, not his speech."

•

How far this concern for a metaphor, ignoring the plain words of the Constitution, will lead is to be seen in a revealing remark by Justice Jackson in the New York released time case. In this case, it will be remembered, the majority opinion backed away somewhat from the path down which the broadened interpretation of the establishment clause was leading the Court. After declaring that we are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being, and declaring that the state acts in our best traditions when it cooperates with religious authorities to make religious instruction available, the Court said it could not find in the Constitution a requirement that government show a callous indifference toward religious groups, for this would be preferring those who believe in no religion over those who do believe. Nor would the Court read into the Bill of Rights a philosophy of hostility to religion. Justice Jackson is chiding the majority for these sentiments, or with professing to abide by the McCollum decision, yet abandoning it. He says: "The wall which the Court was professing to erect between church and state has become even more twisted and warped than I expected." It is, then, the Court, and not the Constitution, that has erected the wall.

And since the appeal is to Jefferson no one will grudge us another quotation from this source:

On every question (of construction of the Constitution) let us carry ourselves back to the time when the Constitution was adopted, recollect the spirit manifest in the debates and instead of trying what meaning may be squeezed out of the text, or invented against it, conform to the probable one in which it was passed.

And on another occasion he insisted that the Constitution be interpreted "according to the plain and ordinary meaning of its language, to the common intendment (understanding) of the time and of those who framed it." And what was the plain and ordinary meaning of the term *establishment*, and of the clause, *Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion?* This point is so much the critical one, so much the burden of our grievance, we must be pardoned for repeating.

From the history of the times, from the Annals of Congress, from the actions of Congress and the Presidents, as well as from the Supreme Court's decisions for the first century and a half, it is clear, we contend, that this provision was meant to be taken, and was interpreted, in its literal sense, that is, Congress was enjoined from any action respecting the setting up of one religious group which would receive favors and status denied to the others. Consider the words of Justice Joseph Story, who was appointed by Madison to the Supreme Court in 1811, just twenty years after the adoption of the Amendment, and served till 1845.

The real object of the Amendment was . . . to exclude all rivalry among Christian sects, and to prevent any national ecclesiastical establishment which should give to a hierarchy the exclusive patronage of the national government.

THESE articles are not written as part of a widespread dissatisfaction with the Court's alleged tendency to set itself up as a legislative body. As this is written (May), I have heard Arthur Krock of the New York Times, in a television panel discussion speak against what he regards as an unwholesome tendency of the Court to rewrite legislation. And David Lawrence wrote recently in the same vein.

Some have even objected to the Court's application of what is called the "rule of reason" in the Court's application of law. These articles have nothing in common with these complaints, and the writer is not competent to pass on their soundness or lack of it. Our grievance is not that the Court applies the Constitution to questions before it. Our grievance is that the Court abandons the relevant wording of the Constitution, ignores its historical meaning, and applies a metaphor. Borrowing the words of Jefferson, again, in a letter of 1825, "they are practicing on the Constitution, by inferences, analogies, and sophisms, as they would on an ordinary law." As a result they take to themselves jurisdiction over cases in which, as Justice Jackson admits, it is idle to pretend they find any guidance in the Constitution, and must rely on their own prepossessions.

POINTED PARAGRAPHS

Prepare Your Child for School

September is a busy month. It means the opening of school and that means hours of work and planning for parents who must provide for their children all the countless items of clothes and shoes and other things needed for the weeks and months of school days ahead.

Besides preparing children in a material way for school, Catholic parents should conscientiously take up the work of preparing the *minds* of their children for the school days ahead — helping them to acquire a correct and serious attitude toward the sisters who will teach them and toward all their work at school. A few well-chosen words of instruction and advice, given by parents at the beginning of the school year, will help the children beyond measure and may prevent a great deal of trouble and worry on the part of the parents themselves.

First of all, the children should be impressed with a deep sense of respect for the sisters and with a trusting confidence in all that they shall decide. They should be told about the lives of the sisters; how they are

consecrated entirely to God; how they have been trained for the great work of educating children not because they want to earn money or gain influence and fame, but simply because they love God and want to help others to love and serve Him; how they should, therefore, be obeyed and trusted in all things pertaining to school.

Secondly, parents should impress upon the children that they themselves will support the sisters in all their decisions. If the sisters decide on correction or punishment in some form or another, the punishment will be considered just and will be added to at home; if the sisters bestow praise or an award, the parents will give further praise and awards at home. The children should be convinced that the sisters act in the name of the parents and with delegated parental authority supporting them.

Thirdly, parents should tell the children that they will be examined at home, as to their progress at school. Perhaps this is not possible in all branches, but in one especially it should be carried out, and that is in catechism or Christian doctrine. This is a duty of parents that may not lightly be dispensed with.

If the child, especially in its earlier years, is prepared for its Catholic schooling in this way, the best results will be assured. Many of the problems of the sisters will be done away with, and many possible heartaches of the parents will be prevented.

Commercialism or Devotion?

The bishop of Tarbes and Lourdes in France, according to a NCWC news release, recently published a notice in his diocese on the right use of Lourdes water and religious articles in general. Our inclination, on reading what he had to say, was to cry: "Bravo for the bishop!"

The miraculous properties of the water from the spring at Lourdes are, of course, well known. Many miracles have taken place at the very time sick people were placed in this water. It is not surprising that the faithful should want to carry some of this water home with them when they return from a pilgrimage to Lourdes. Nor certainly is this custom to be reprobated, so long as the directive of our Lady to Bernadette is kept in mind: "Go and drink from the spring and wash in it."

Of late years, however, there have appeared on the scene small crucifixes and rosary beads which are advertised as containing Lourdes water. This, according to the bishop (and we are certainly inclined to agree with him), is an abuse. Lourdes water should not be sold, nor should it be contained in any object, pious or otherwise, which is sold.

Moreover, the bishop went on to say, it is an abuse to ornament such

things as ash trays, cigarette cases, perfume bottles and the like with the picture of our Lady of Lourdes. Too often it is not piety but rank commercialism which dictates such use of our Lady's picture. There is all the greater abuse, the bishop cautions, if these articles are advertised as blessed even before they are sold.

We have felt for some time that there is room for improvement in the popular attitude toward the use of religious articles. Certainly these articles should have a definite place in the life of the individual Catholic. A rosary, a blessed medal, a prayer book: these can do much to help him keep his faith vital and make it easier for him to pray. Moreover, it should be standard procedure in every Catholic home to have a crucifix hanging above the bed and pictures of our Lord and His mother on the walls.

These things we take for granted; nevertheless we feel with the bishop of Lourdes that a caution is in order from time to time. That word of caution should be directed first of all to the general Catholic public. Let people be more on their guard against the gimcrack or novelty type of religious article; gadgets which in equal parts combine the devotional and the sensational. If people were to stop buying them, they would disappear.

Then also we think the religious goods stores have a responsibility in this matter. Some may object: "This is what the public wants; we are merely catering to public demand." But surely any such real or imaginary demand should be balanced by a

consulting of the objective norms of dignity and fittingness.

Finally, it seems to us that magazines and newspapers which consistently carry advertising for the gim-crack and sensational novelty type of religious article are at fault. They also have a responsibility to their readers not to publicize the type of article which is the object of just complaint on the part of the bishop of Lourdes and many others who agree with him.

Broadcasting the Truth

Worthy of much praise, we think, are those dedicated individuals who are striving to bring Catholic truth and the Catholic attitude toward life and its problems to large audiences via radio and television. There are a number of these religious and inspirational programs on the air; perhaps the most successful of all is the Sacred Heart program.

Originating in 1955 over station KTVI in St. Louis, the organization's television films are now seen over 100 TV stations. As for the radio program, now in its second decade, it is heard over 3000 times weekly on more than 1000 stations. Truly an impressive total for a religious program!

Father Eugene Murphy, S.J., founder of the program, is its national director. It is offered free of charge to all stations on a sustaining basis. Its makeup includes choral singing by outstanding choral groups and short talks by a speaking staff of American and Canadian priests noted for their abilities both in scholarship and in preaching. The program comes in the form of a fifteen-min-

ute package. From its wide acceptance, certainly no one can deny its popularity, just as no one who has seen the program can deny its solid worth.

Speakers, singers, office workers and technicians, who donate their time, and friends and listeners who help defray production and shipping costs make this apostolate of the air waves possible.

If the Sacred Heart program is produced in your area, plan to listen to it, and having done so, why not write a line of appreciation to your local radio or television station manager? If it is not in your local radio or TV listings, perhaps a small crusade might be in order to show that there is public interest in the presentation of such a worthwhile and wholesome feature.

Degree of Distinction

A phenomenon of our day is the large number of college students who are working toward their college degree, while at the same time they are caught up in the manifold duties and responsibilities of family life. Driving through almost any college campus, one can see rows of barracks-like buildings which contain apartments for these married students. The endless clothes-lines festooned with laundered diapers, and the not infrequent wails of small children emanating from these small apartments, stand as a kind of symbol of the difficulties which must surround the efforts of these young men to fulfill their study requirements.

Our purpose here is not to censure them for getting married while still in college. One good feature of this

kind of marriage may well be that it steadies the young men and makes them much more mature and responsive to the opportunities given them in their college courses.

What we have in mind is a word of praise for that unsung heroine, the college man's wife. A distinguished professor told us not long ago that in his opinion there should be a special degree for these self-sacrificing young women, a degree signified by the letters Ph.T. The letters, he said, stand for "Putting Husband Through." No class credits are needed for this degree. What is required is only that the wife keep her husband reasonably contented and working hard at his studies while she shoulders more than her share of household work and care of the children, and at the same time she remains a cheerful and a genuine source of inspiration to her spouse.

There are some young wives who doubtless would not qualify for this degree; the effort is too much for them. They give up trying, and their husbands in turn give up in their own efforts to reach the scholastic goal of graduation. But there are other wives who come through with flying colors, and who on commencement day deserve to wear a mortar-board as much as their proud husbands.

More power to them we say, and we hope they will always have the energy to do what is best and what is God's will for their husbands and their children and themselves.

Sins against Citizenship

Many Americans demonstrate a rather low opinion of politics, and

only a slightly higher one of politicians. Yet if politics can be defined as the art of government, it behooves every citizen in a democracy to be interested in it, and anxious to preserve the integrity of this difficult art.

Archbishop Cushing of Boston in a recent address listed some of the unworthy reasons why people who might be otherwise well-qualified attempt to justify their staying entirely clear of the political arena. They are indeed deserving of the title which he gives them: the "ten sins against citizenship."

Indifference: "I'm not interested in politics."

Laziness: "I'm too busy."

Greed: "I'm doing O.K. as things are."

Prejudice: "I'll vote for him because he's one of our kind."

False pride: "I'm not going to get mixed up in dirty politics."

Cynicism: "My one vote won't make any difference."

Hopelessness: "Pressure groups run the show anyway."

Ineligibility: "I didn't register."

Why-bother attitude: "Politicians are all alike."

Cowardice: "I don't want my character assailed."

It does indeed take courage to be a good politician, it requires an effort to acquire a good grasp of whom and what one should vote for. But such courage and ideals and effort are badly needed if our democracy is to continue functioning as the founding fathers meant it to function.

LIGUORIANA

THE WORLD CONVERTED

By St. Alphonsus
Selected and Edited by
John P. Schaefer, C.S.S.R.

ONE OF the most convincing proofs of the truth of our Catholic faith is the historical fact of the conversion of the then-known world by Jesus Christ and His apostles. This was an astounding accomplishment. To appreciate what it meant we must transport ourselves back over centuries of history, and remind ourselves of the condition of the world at the time of Christ.

It was a world plunged into all kinds of vices and errors to which it had been led because of the corruption of human nature by sin. In the face of such corruption the promulgation of a New Law seemed hopeless. All the more so because of the ignorance and natural weakness of those who would preach it, and because of the efforts which the leaders of a corrupt society would make that such new doctrines would not be accepted.

This new faith was not only a difficult thing to accept, but it even dared to propose mysteries to be believed — doctrines which cannot be understood by human reason. It proposed the mystery of the most holy Trinity, maintaining that there are

three divine persons in one God. It demanded that men believe the mystery of the incarnation of Christ: that one person was both God and man; that He was crucified and suffered death for the salvation of the human race; that therefore, we must adore as God the man condemned and put to death on the cross! A difficult thing, indeed, to believe! No wonder St. Paul would complain: "We preach Christ crucified: unto the Jews, indeed, a stumbling block, and unto the Gentiles foolishness."

Nor could a carnal world be said to be ready to accept such a doctrine as the Holy Eucharist: the belief that the substance of bread and wine is changed into the body and blood of Jesus Christ through the words of consecration. A pleasure-seeking world hardly had time to stop to think of such things as the resurrection of the dead, that the body would return to dust only to rise on the day of final judgment.

But if the beliefs of this New Law were outlandish, the law which this new faith proposed was even more unbearable. It extolled self-denial, the conquering of one's passions, the love of our enemies, the mortification of the flesh. It actually believed in suffering, the humbling of oneself be-

fore the world, the bearing of contempt — all to the point of placing one's entire hope in a nebulous future life. All of this they dared to preach to those who were accustomed to every kind of vice and who looked to nothing beyond the pleasures of the present life.

And who was to do this? Who would promulgate this New Law of Jesus Christ? Who would root out idolatry and so many vices? Only a handful of rude fishermen. Illiterate men. Men who were born of humble parents. They lacked even the help which money could give. No family background, no ancestral dignity was theirs. And yet they would convert the world! Unbelievable!

And behold the obstacles encountered by these miserable fishermen! Judges, princes, emperors placed in their path all the obstacles which their power could muster. They would not sit by idly and see their world of pleasure crumble. The fishermen would be sent into exile. They would be despoiled of their goods; and all who would embrace this new faith would be subjected to a dreadful death.

The result? Unbelievable! The preachers of this new Christian faith saw it spread and accepted over the whole world within the space of a few years. St. Paul could well rejoice in writing to the Romans: "Your faith is spoken of in the whole world." In only the second century Ignatius and Irenaeus could testify that the Christian religion had now

been spread over all the inhabited provinces.

Men who had before venerated false gods now trampled them under foot. These preachers of Jesus Christ had the pleasure of seeing their listeners accept and believe incredible mysteries. They had the happiness of seeing inveterate vices stamped out. Illicit pleasures of the body, for which men had lived, they now saw despised; worldly honors and riches they saw forsaken. All for love of this new Christian religion!

Men, who came to be known as hermits, abandoned home and country to live in the deserts. Great numbers of martyrs accepted such torments that the cruelty of man and the fury of demons could not invent greater, rather than abandon this new faith. All the riches and honors which emperors could offer them they rejected, to embrace torments and death. So did these holy Christians burn with love for Jesus Christ.

Prefects of the provinces wrote to the emperors that they could not find instruments and executioners enough to accommodate the multitude of Christians offering themselves to die for the faith of Jesus Christ. It seemed that these men had been stripped of human nature, that they had lost that natural horror which torments and death inspire. The more the prefects and emperors persecuted these Christians, the more the faith was spread. In the place of the many who were stamped out, multitudes more sprang up.

There can be no other answer for this phenomenon than divine power.

How else can this spread of the faith over the whole world be explained in the face of such terrible persecution? And, in the midst of it all, churches were built among the Jews and Greeks, in the midst of the Romans and Scythians and Persians, in the land of every barbarous nation as far as the extremities of the world.

How long did this take? Tertullian maintains that by the beginning of the second century there was no part of the world where Christians were not to be found. The historian, Palladius, relates that in the beginning of the fourth century there existed one community in Egypt where twenty-thousand virgins had consecrated themselves to the religious life.

Because our holy faith has been embraced by all people it is called Catholic. That is, it is universal. Not because individual men have em-

braced it, but because it has been accepted by all nations, and has been spread over the whole world. Even in our day, though there are many societies of heretics outside the bosom of the Church, still there is scarcely a corner of the globe where the faithful do not profess the faith and build churches where the holy sacrifice of the Mass is offered to God at least secretly.

"It is sufficient," St. Augustine argues, "that true Christians are found in the whole world. For the Church to be called Catholic it is not necessary that all men of every nation profess the faith, but that some men profess the faith in every nation. No man can be lawfully and wilfully ignorant of the Catholic Church. He alone does not see it who voluntarily closes his eyes for fear that he will see it."

LIGHT OF LOURDES

At Lourdes all social barriers collapse as if by a miracle. There you can find no more proletarians and capitalists, progressives and reactionaries, rich and poor. Lourdes unites hearts and minds, as pain allies the suffering bodies. No one brings "class problems" to Lourdes, because here there is only one class: that of men suffering on account of original sin, and praying before Mary Immaculate.

At Mary's grotto there are men and women that no tyranny will ever succeed in bending; men and women without the weapons of war but who, with candles in hand and the rosary on their lips, are ready to face any enemy on any field with a procession that no force will ever stop.

Not even the Red armies will stop that procession, for even they will fall under the impetus of this peaceful army, that will one day penetrate with its candles and rosaries into the heart of the Russian steppes, where the White Lady of Fatima has promised us an appointment. To live in the light of Lourdes, as in the light of Fatima, is to live with this great procession that walks and prays for the redemption of the world.

L'Aurora



BOOK REVIEWS

Thomas Tobin, C.S.S.R.

We recommend that books listed or reviewed in THE LIGUORIAN be purchased at your local bookstore. If you cannot obtain the book in that way, you may write to THE LIGUORIAN for further information.

Melody in Your Hearts Rev. George L. Kane, Editor

This is a sequel to two earlier books, *Why I Entered the Convent* and *A Seal Upon My Heart*. In these books a group of sisters explained the reasons that led them to the religious life; in this book thirteen of the same authors describe convent life as they have experienced it. The title, *Melody in Your Hearts*, indicates the joy and happiness that these women have found in their dedicated lives, as well as the light-hearted style which reflects their inner joy. It would be difficult to single out any particular essay but this reviewer liked especially the piece by the sister who works with *Melody in Her Heart* for God's special ones, the retarded children. This is a wonderful book for all those who want to know about nuns written by the only ones who have first-hand information. Especially good for the girl who is wondering about a possible religious vocation or for parents who are reluctant to allow their daughters to answer the call of Christ.

(Newman, \$3.00)

Saint Bernadette

Margaret Trouncer

Margaret Trouncer revealed herself as an accomplished biographer of the saints in *The Sun*, the story of St. Margaret Mary. She brings the same skill in the fictionalized biography of St. Bernadette, the Child and the Nun. Miss Trouncer has an uncanny ability to recreate the living details of a scene from the sometimes scanty historical information. She is especially skillful in phrasing appropriate dialogue that rings true to the character of a person. The two sections of the book portray Bernadette as the child favored by the Blessed Virgin and as the nun dedicated to the love of Christ and Mary. A very authentic and absorbing narrative. May Miss Trouncer continue to make the saints live under the magic of her talented pen.

(Sheed and Ward, \$3.75)

What Happened to Religious Education

William Kailer Dunn

Father William K. Dunn wrote his doctorate thesis at Johns Hopkins University on religion in the thirteen original states between the years, 1776-1861. In very carefully documented pages he shows that all the early schools were religious in nature and that the decline and final exclusion of religious education in the public schools came as a result of sectarian fights about which Christian creed and ethic was to be taught. Emphatically does he make the point that religion was not excluded because the first amendment forbade this teaching, but to safeguard the liberty of every person to follow his own particular kind of Christianity. An excellent and scholarly book that makes easy and informative reading for all who wish to have the background material for current controversies. The final chapter summarizes the thesis established by the author's research.

(Johns Hopkins Press \$5.00)

The Temptations of Christ

Gerald Vann, O.P.
P. K. Meagher, O.P.

It has become the fashion to deny or disregard the existence of the devil, but several recent books have presented the Christian theology of the evil spirit. Two Dominican theologians discuss the activity of the devil in the *Temptations of Christ*. This interesting book explains the nature of the temptations actually experienced by Christ and insists there was a real conflict between two possible choices. The book emphasizes practical applications for us in our own struggles against temptation. A solid book with deep insight into the nature of Christ's temptations and into our own temptations.

(Sheed and Ward, \$2.75)

Approach to Penance

Dom Hubert Van Zeller, O.S.B.

An old subject is given modern treatment by an experienced writer. Dom Hubert combines solid philosophical and theological knowledge with psychological insight into human life and skill with words in his latest book on a topic about which there are many misconceptions. On the first page the reader is warned that penitence is not so much a conversion from sin as a conversion to God; the remaining pages develop this positive presentation. Another quality spiritual book that is recommended to all who have the time and inclination to read books that will give them a deeper understanding of themselves and the role of penance in their lives.

(Sheed and Ward, \$2.50)

Beyond My Worth

Lillian Roth

Readers of *I'll Cry Tomorrow* will be interested to learn of what has happened to Lillian Roth since that time. *Beyond My Worth* brings the career of Miss Roth up to date. She has not touched a drop of liquor, she has met many people who have helped her, she has won success as an actress and night-club entertainer, and she has serious doubts about the Catholic religion and is not at present a practicing Catholic. A fast-reading book.

(Frederick Fell, \$3.95)

Rome

Schwann Travel Guide

Lourdes, Cathedral Tour

Schwann Travel Guide

THE LIGUORIAN welcomes to the Catholic publishing field David L. McManus and his new firm, the Helicon Press. Affiliated with the German Company, L. Schwann, its first books are translations of two volumes in the famous Schwann Travel Guide series. The purpose of this new volume is to furnish an explanation of Catholic points of interest in Europe. The chapter headings of the first booklet, Rome, indicate the scope of the matter covered: Rome of the Pilgrims, of the Martyrs, of the Catacombs, of the Early Christians, of the Monks, Raphael and Michaelangelo, Rome of the Baroque, Museums and Vatican City.

The second volume is the Cathedral Tour of the famous cathedrals of France with a few pages on Lourdes.

Practical tips on lodging, food, travel, etc., add to the value of the new series which serve as preparation for a journey, handy guide during it, and a souvenir to recall many pleasant memories.

(Helicon Press, \$1.50 ea.)

Autobiography of St. Therese of Lisieux

Translated by Ronald Knox

After the Little Flower had written her autobiography she gave full permission to her blood and religious sister, Mother Agnes, to make any changes that she deemed prudent. In deference to the living people who figured in the book, certain passages were changed. But now, with the death of Mother Agnes, the complete text as written by St. Therese has been issued in France. English readers are very fortunate to be able to read the splendid version of the autobiography by the late Monsignor Ronald A. Knox. The translation is simple in keeping with the original. This could well be the standard edition of the *Autobiography of St. Therese of Lisieux*.

(P. J. Kennedy and Sons, \$4.50)

LUCID INTERVALS



Billy waited until school was over and then slowly approached his teacher's desk.

"Yes?" she said.

"I don't want to scare you or anything, Mrs. Brown," said Billy, "but my father said if I don't bring home a better report card someone is going to get a licking."

Tom: "Mom, you're a lucky woman."

Mom: "How is that?"

Tom: "You won't have to buy me school books this year, I'm taking all of last year's work over again."

Hetty: "Hey, is my cat smart?"

Betty: "How come?"

Hetty: "She eats cheese and then waits in front of a mouse-hole with baited breath."

"Do you say all your prayers every night?" Sister asked a little five-year-old.

"Mother says one of them for me," answered the tot.

"Which one does mother say," inquired Sister.

"Thank heaven, you're finally tucked in bed."

A convent of French nuns in England had a Reverend Mother who learned the English language rather late in life. She mastered it quite well, but some of its nuances escaped her.

After noticing with rising perturbation the mounting totals on her butcher bills, she astounded her butcher one day by sending him the following note:

"Why are you so much dearer to me now than when we were first engaged?"

An elderly lady, driving along nonchalantly, turned a corner and ran over a teen-aged youth crossing the street. Without change of expression the old lady pulled up on the other side of the victim, rolled down her window and called, "Young man, you'd better look out."

Rising to one elbow the trembling youth exclaimed, "My gosh, lady, don't tell me you're gonna back up."

The passenger in an airplane noticed a parachutist floating past the window.

"Going to join me?" called the man on the parachute.

"Not on your life," answered the passenger. "I'm quite all right where I am."

"Please yourself," retorted the parachutist. "I'm the pilot."



Harry: "Why did you tip your hat to that guy?"

Baldy: "That's my old barber. He sold me some sure-fire hair grower, and so whenever I meet him I let him see what a fraud he is."

Recovering from an operation, a patient asked the doctor, "Why are all the blinds drawn?"

The doctor replied: "Well, there's a fire across the street, and I didn't want you to wake up and think your operation was a failure!"

FILE 13

For that rundown feeling, try jay-walking.

BEST SELLERS

A Moral Evaluation of Current Books, Published at the University of Scranton, Pa.

MOST POPULAR

(Not necessarily approved. Roman numeral indicates a moral rating according to categories used in general list.)

Anatomy of a Murder (IIb)—Traver
The Winthrop Woman (IIb)—Seton
Ice Palace (IIa)—Ferber
A Summer Place (IIb)—Wilson
North from Rome (I)—MacInnes
The Sergeant (III)—Murphy
The Greengage Summer (IIa)—
Goddon
By Love Possessed (IIb)—Cozzens
Rally Round the Flag Boys (III)—
Schulman
The Mackerel Plaza (IIa)—DeVries
Maggie-Now (I)—Smith
The White Witch (IIa)—Goudge
Travels of Jaimie McPherson (IIb)—
Taylor
Time and the Hour (I)—Spring
Ride the Red Earth (IIb)—Wellman

I. Suitable for general reading:

The Man in Gray—Crane
The Edge of Tomorrow—Dooley
Foreign Policy: The Next Phase—
Finletter
The Steadfast Man—Gallico
Thunder at Harper's Ferry—Keller
Malice in Wonderland—King
The Autobiography of St. Therese of
Lisieux—Knox
The Millionth Chance—Leasor
Doctors to the World—Morgan
The Saints and Our Children—
Newland
73 North—Pope
Life at My Fingertips—Smithdas
St. Dingan's Bones—Callender
The Thing About Clarissa—Cook
Death of a Nation—Dowdley
A New England Girlhood—Hale
Night March—Lancaster
Rough Road Home—Mather

II. Suitable only for adults:

A. Because of advanced style and contents:
Free Society and Moral Crisis—Angell
The Decline of the American Male—
Attwood
I Don't Want to Shoot an Elephant—
Babcock
The Schemers—Fenisong
So Merciful a Queen, So Cruel a
Woman—Harwood
Coppermine Journey—Hearne
Erika and the King—Leuchtag
Your Child Is What He Eats—Lynch
The Wine Princes—Mackay
Kiboko—Mannix
The Diamond Six—Smith
The Bright Road to Fear—Stern
Thunder on the Right—Stewart
Night of Reckoning—Strange
Desperate Mission—Brand & Weissberg
The Northern Light—Cronin
Centenary at Jalna—De la Roche

B. Because of immoral incidents which do
not, however, invalidate the book
as a whole:

The Dragon Tree—Canning
The Image Makers—Dryer
As Music and Splendour—O'Brien
The Time of the Juggernaut—
Steinhouse
The Passionate City—Black
The Human Element—Fores
A Fine and Private Place—Hebson
Crack of Doom—Heinrich
The Underground City—Humes
The Old Blood—Mittelholzer
The Loom of History—Muller

III. Permissible for the discriminating adult:

A Matter of Life and Death—Bailey
Wind Rose—Hull
Spring Returns—Long
The Enemy Camp—Weidman
Chiara—D'Olive

IV. Not recommended to any reader:

A Case of Conscience—Blish
The Affair—Koningsberger
The Immortal—Ross

FREE COPIES OF THE LIGUORIAN

If you like THE LIGUORIAN, give some of your friends or relatives the opportunity of liking it too. They may want to order a subscription for themselves.

If you would like to have a single complimentary copy of THE LIGUORIAN mailed to some of your relatives or friends, just write their names and addresses in the space below and mail to —

THE LIGUORIAN

Box 36 • Liguori, Missouri

Please send a complimentary copy of THE LIGUORIAN to:

Name.....

Street and No.

City..... Zone..... State.....

Name.....

Street and No.

City..... Zone..... State.....

Name.....

Street and No.

City..... Zone..... State.....

